



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2014

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 2, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

GOP BUDGET AND INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, the path to prosperity has been infrastructure. It has been paving that path, building that road, constructing the transcontinental railroad, improving water systems, extending electrification to rural America, dams, flood control, and sewer systems.

Each and every one of these initiatives were key to improving the qual-

ity of life for Americans, enacting business opportunities, and putting millions of Americans to work.

They were all public-private partnerships primarily paid for with public investment. Creating these infrastructure marvels, which for most of our history were the envy of the world, put millions of Americans to work.

Sadly, that is no longer the case. The United States has fallen behind the global leaders. Our infrastructure is mediocre, according to expert reports. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our infrastructure a D-plus rating and identified over \$3.5 trillion of investments that are going to be necessary just to bring it up to standard by 2020.

That is how far we have fallen—a D-plus rating—and needing billions of dollars just to prevent further deterioration and decline.

The failure to act carries significant costs in and of itself. There is more wear and tear on vehicles. There is more delays and congestion. There are safety problems associated with inferior infrastructure and poor maintenance.

It is going to cost the average American family over \$1,000 per year in actual damage and increased operating costs to say nothing of the millions of hours lost to congestion. It hits business especially hard. A 5-minute delay costs UPS \$50 million in additional costs each year.

Ten years ago, there was a blue ribbon report to then-President Bush about transportation and transportation funding alternatives. It identified over \$375 billion as necessary to fund an appropriate 6-year program. That was 10 years ago.

We are now spending at a rate, 10 years later, of about \$275 billion a year at current levels, but the highway trust fund is only going to produce about \$200 billion during that same period of time.

Both Chairman CAMP in his tax reform proposal and President Obama in his infrastructure proposal identified ways to close this gap to be able to fully fund a 6-year transportation reauthorization that would help meet America's funding needs for projects of national significance that are, in many cases, multistate and are part of a national system. We all depend upon the pieces of the system to be in place in good repair and working together.

Sadly, the Republican budget sentences us to decline and then locks in a 30 percent reduction from these current inadequate levels over the next 10 years.

It pretends the Federal commitment can be downsized and outsourced. Although I would note, in a letter signed by 31 executives of statewide chambers of commerce, they point out:

Even with increased State revenues and innovative mechanisms such as public-private partnerships, there are projects of national significance that cannot be completed without Federal assistance.

I will be offering today a proposal in the Budget Committee to at least allow the capacity to respond to these needs, to meet the requests of 17 bipartisan governors, including Republicans from North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania and the 31 State chamber of commerce executives from Alabama, Arizona, and Arkansas, to Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. We need these Federal partnerships.

While this proposal won't commit anybody to a specific path forward, it does provide the capacity to get us unstuck and out of this sad state of decline, in other words, a true path to prosperity, putting millions of people to work, jump-starting the economy, and strengthening communities from coast to coast, so that our families can be safe, healthy, and economically secure.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2805

IT IS TIME TO QUIT LEADING FROM BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the crisis in Ukraine, Putin's rising aggression and intransigence in the face of increased international opprobrium, and the failure of American leadership that has allowed these recent events to transpire.

This is yet another example of Vladimir Putin looking at President Obama's foreign policy and making the calculation that he can do whatever he wants without fear that the White House will react with anything other than empty threats.

We have seen this time and time again, so much so that the President's lead from behind policy has not only eroded our influence and credibility around the world, it has hurt our relations with other countries, and it has shown tyrants like Putin, Assad, Maduro, Kim Jung Un, Khamenei, and the Castros that the U.S. lacks the courage of its convictions.

Putin has annexed Crimea, and we would be foolish to think that he will stop there as he seeks to reestablish Russia as more than just a regional power, and the Obama administration has misguidedly dismissed Putin and his provocations as those of a weakened Russia acting out.

This is an astonishing view to take and one that could seriously harm our U.S. national security interests if we continue to downplay these threats.

In 1994, the United States, along with Ukraine and Russia, signed the Budapest memorandum. In that agreement, all sides agreed to respect Ukraine's territorial sovereignty if Ukraine returned the nuclear weapons it inherited after the fall of the Soviet empire. We gave our guarantee to protect Ukraine's borders, a guarantee that we clearly did not keep.

What kind of message is the United States sending to the world again?

You can bet that Rouhani and Khamenei are sitting in Iran, and they are paying very close attention, Mr. Speaker. They are making the calculations right now, and they are betting that perhaps they will face no repercussions if they abandoned the negotiations and actively and openly pursue nuclear weapons.

President Obama's lack of leadership and strength has shown that the umbrella of U.S. security that so many have relied upon is not as wide nor as durable as they once thought.

The House and the Senate have acted to pass sanctions legislation against Putin over his actions in Crimea, but it is clear that Putin is not going to be deterred by this.

It may be a case of too little, too late because the administration failed to take decisive action from the get-go, just like it had in Iran and Syria before this and just like it is now failing to do in Venezuela.

While Obama threatens consequences for Putin over his Crimea provocations—and fails to act on these words—he hasn't even mustered up the fortitude to even feign strong condemnations for Maduro and his thugs in Venezuela, as they continue to brutally oppress the opposition in Venezuela, the opposition that is calling for reforms and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a poster of Maria Corina Machado, a valiant human rights leader in Venezuela, and she is just one of the many victims of Maduro's thuggery.

There have been 30 people killed as a result of Maduro's violent attempts to oppress dissent, while opposition leaders like Leopoldo Lopez have been unjustly detained over a month now in military prison, and Maria Corina Machado has been stripped of her seat in the national assembly, thus revoking her immunity, her protection, suggesting that Maduro and his goons will soon be coming to take her away to a military prison.

Yet again, President Obama chooses to lead from behind. The administration has repeatedly said that we need to work with the Organization of American States to hold Maduro accountable, but that body is even more afraid to call out Maduro than this administration.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years of failed foreign policy from this administration is really coming home to roost, and that means dire consequences for the American people, for the people of Venezuela, for the people of Ukraine, and for freedom-seeking people throughout the world.

It is time for the administration to take an active role in foreign policy for the sake of American national security and for the sake of the future of democracy. It is time to quit this leading from behind. It is time to restore American leadership, and that is the only way to make the world a safer place.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET MORE OF THE SAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the baseball season begins this week, so I will quote the great Yogi Berra. "It's déjà vu all over again."

This year's Republican budget, which Chairman RYAN unveiled yesterday, is more of the same we have, unfortunately, come to expect. It is an exercise in partisan messaging, not a serious and honest attempt to invest in our priorities and pursue compromise toward a sustainable fiscal outlook.

Their budget rejects the balanced approach of spending reforms, new revenue, and investments in our economy called for by both the Bowles-Simpson and the Rivlin-Domenici Commissions, as well as by the Gang of Six in the United States Senate and by virtually

every economist. The Ryan budget cuts \$5 trillion without a single penny of new revenue, not even a hint of balance.

Moreover, Chairman RYAN's budget once again relies on the magic asterisk of hundreds of billions of dollars in spending cuts to important domestic programs. He doesn't say what programs we are going to cut; he simply says we are going to get the money.

He said that last year, of course, and it didn't happen. He gives virtually no details about the policies through which he expects to achieve these savings. To that extent, it is radically different from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee's tax reform plan, which made real choices, showed real courage, and was a real document.

The Republican budget continues their obsession with repealing or undermining the Affordable Care Act, their 53rd attempt to do so. However, of course, they keep all the savings and revenues that the Affordable Care Act is scored as giving.

It would furthermore kick millions off their health insurance and turn Medicaid into a capped block grant, decimating the program and making life more difficult for all those millions who rely on it.

Once more, they are seeking to end the Medicare guarantee as we know it. They will say it is a choice, that at 55 you can make a choice whether you want to have private insurance with a voucher that you get from the Federal Government or go into Medicare. That's what they say.

□ 1015

The reality is, however, they would make traditional Medicare far, far, far more expensive, driving people out of that program and eliminating it over time.

Their budget, in addition, would make it very difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to invest in our economy and our people by driving domestic discretionary spending well below the sequester's harmful level.

The American people ought to be outraged but not surprised. We have seen this movie before, and it never ends well for Republicans or, tragically, does it end happily for the American people. The new plot twist in this year's budget is that Chairman RYAN is going where no budget chairman has gone before, relying on the spurious gimmickry of so-called "dynamic scoring" to pad his numbers with budget savings that simply do not exist.

We have talked about this a lot. The 1981 tax cuts were supposed to boom the economy. In fact, we increased the national debt by 187 percent. In 2001 and 2003, we were promised that the tax cuts would grow the economy. In fact, during those 8 years of the Bush administration, we had the worst economy that anybody in this Chamber has experienced and, indeed, I would presume, in the gallery as well.

While Chairman RYAN claims his budget balances in 10 years, in reality, his projection for revenues in 2024 is less than his projection for outlays. In other words, no balance. That is the simple budget math. The only way Chairman RYAN can pretend his math works is by using Republicans' dynamic scoring trick.

This is the same trick that paved the way for the Bush tax cuts to turn record surpluses into record deficits, as I have said. It is sort of like a family making its budget and projecting: well, we are going to get a big raise because the boss is going to be doing better, the economy is going to be doing better, and we will get a big raise, so we will budget as if we had already gotten the raise. What happens is you don't get that raise and you are deeply in the hole. Americans get that. It is a shame their Congress doesn't get that.

Republicans have a bill on the floor this week to force the nonpartisan CBO to use the Republican math. The virtue of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office was that it would give us honest numbers, but now the Republicans want to force them to give them their numbers that they want that make it easier for them to pretend that things are going to get better with their policies rather than putting their policies in place and then seeing if it does get better, and if it does, we have a bonus. Of course, if it doesn't, we run up large deficits as we did in the last administration, as we did in the Reagan administration, as we did in the first Bush administration, and, yes, slightly in the Clinton administration. But in the Clinton administration, over every Republican's objections, we balanced the budget for 4 years.

We need a budget, Madam Speaker, that reflects our real challenges and recognizes that we must compromise to make the difficult choices necessary to meet them. The American people deserve a budget that focuses not on gimmicks but one that promotes opportunity, growth, and security; compromise, not confrontation; pragmatism, not partisanship; what works, not what sounds good.

Our budget proposal should reflect our priorities and enable us to rise to meet our challenges. The Republican budget that is going to be voted on today in the Budget Committee does not do that.

The Wall Street Journal, Madam Speaker, wrote an editorial about the Ryan priorities, most of which I disagree with because I think their reliance, as RYAN does, on dynamic scoring is a "fool's errand" and has been proved to be such over the years that I have served in Congress over the last 33 years. But I do agree with their conclusion, and they say this:

But the Ryan outline does the service of showing the policy direction in which Republicans would head if they regain control of the Senate next year.

I agree with that. I think this is a litmus test for the American people. They

can review the Ryan budget. They can review its consequences to them, themselves, their families, their children, and their community. They can see the adverse consequences of a plan that will not work.

I predict, as I predicted last year, Madam Speaker, the Appropriations Committee, headed by HAL ROGERS, Republican chairman, will not bring appropriation bills to the floor that will pass on this floor that will implement the Ryan budget, notwithstanding the fact that RYAN's party controls this House. I predicted that last year, and I was right. As a matter of fact, no bills passed this House at the Ryan budget numbers last year—none, not one. Sadly, I think that is what is going to happen this year—sadly, for the American people; sadly, for this Congress; sadly, for our children.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. We can be real. We ought to do the job that the American people expect us to do and get this country on a fiscally sustainable path, not with smoke and mirrors but with sincerity and courage.

CONGRESSIONAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, if you listen to probably the majority of the speeches provided on this House floor, they clearly indicate partisan bickering. If you listen to many of these speeches, it is pretty easy to find out what we disagree upon. There are some divides in beliefs and opinions. One of the things that is wonderful about this House is this is the people's House. It reflects a very diverse nation, and we have diverse opinions here on the House floor.

At the same time, there are individuals here that I work with, both sides of the aisle, that I think want to be problem solvers. They are willing to not talk about what we disagree about, because we don't even need to do that; we just turn on the news, and that is what is highlighted is what we disagree upon. But the fact is we do have individuals here that have the courage and willingness to come to the table, and that is step one; to sit at the table and define properly what the problem is, because without defining the problem, you really aren't going to come up with effective solutions that work; and third, be willing to state what do we agree upon, what can we agree upon and make that the beginning point, the foundation, for cost-effective solutions.

I am here today as part of a group that really does that. I rise today as cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus. This is a group of Members from both sides of the aisle, diverse routes of the United States, who care about investing in opportunities for individuals

to be able to do better in life through education. My opinion is: it is not so important where you start in life; it is where you end up. The key to that stair or that ladder or that path is education.

The Career and Technical Education Caucus really, really focuses on that in a bipartisan way. It is about America's competitiveness. Because if America does not have a qualified and trained workforce, America doesn't have a future. So as appropriation season is upon us, we in the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus encourage our colleagues to continue this body's united commitment to ensuring that America remains competitive through an adequately trained workforce.

This can be achieved through an existing program. We don't have to create a new program. No need to reinvent the wheel. It is the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. Perkins provides the principal source of Federal support for program improvement and helps to strengthen the integration of academic, career, and technical education at both the secondary and the postsecondary institutions.

Although deficit reduction must remain priority number one—it is one of our greatest threats for national security—during these fiscally challenging times, we must invest in CTE programs. We must also recognize that any reduction to Perkins funding would affect millions of career and technical educational students, the business community that relies on a qualified workforce, and the future competitiveness of this country.

Going into the fiscal year 2015, the Career and Technical Education Caucus is putting together a modest request for level funding for this program. I encourage my colleagues to support the efforts of the caucus and join in sending this important request to the Appropriations Committee.

LET'S PASS AN IMMIGRATION REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, on June 27, we will mark 1 year since our friends on the other side of the Hill in the United States Senate passed a bipartisan immigration reform bill.

Four Senators from each party worked together to get a bill introduced on April 16 of last year. By May, the Judiciary Committee was debating and marking it up, and by June, it was headed to the Senate floor. Then after debate and many, many, many amendments, it was voted on by the full Senate. Sixty-eight out of 100 Senators voted to replace illegal immigration with legal immigration, legalize millions of people who live and work in the U.S., and secure our immigration system in the workplace and, yes, at the border.

Madam Speaker, almost a year with no serious movement forward on immigration reform in the House, I am beginning to wonder whether Republicans will get serious about immigration before they run out of time. Well, I want to be helpful, so I have done a little calculating. Including today, we have 34 legislative days before the July 4 recess.

Madam Speaker, let's be honest. If Republicans have not gotten an immigration bill seriously rolling down the tracks by the time we break for Independence Day, Republicans might as well just fold up the tent they are always talking about. One thing is for sure: Republicans won't be pitching a tent at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue any time soon.

I talk to Republicans, and they know the truth: if Republicans don't work with Democrats and bring an immigration bill to the floor, they are giving up on a chance to stand for justice, a sense of peace, and fairness for immigrants until after the 2016 Presidential election. That means Republicans will have to head into the 2016 Presidential election as the party that blocked immigration reform that would have finally brought justice to immigrant communities across our Nation. You will have said "no" to the dreams of DREAMers and "no" to millions of families and "no" to communities in every city across our country.

Oh, and, Madam Speaker, if you think the Republican Party alone controls the future of 11 million undocumented immigrants, you will be sadly disappointed. If you don't act in the next 34 days, if you refuse to give the President a bill he can sign because you say you don't trust him to enforce immigration law even though he has spent more money and deported more people than any President before him, I believe he will act without you.

He has alternatives under existing law. There are concrete ways within existing laws to help keep families together and spare U.S. citizens from losing their wives, their husbands, and their children to deportation in spite of your lack of action, and I believe the President is going to use those tools. I saw it in his eyes when I met with him. He didn't run for office so that he could deport 2 million people and put thousands of American children in foster care. He is heartbroken by the pain deportation has caused.

Do you think he will simply sit by and do nothing because you refuse to act? The Republicans threaten lawsuits and even impeachment if the President acts to spare American families being broken apart by deportation; but this President will act if you refuse to, and the country will rally behind him because that is what Americans do in the face of humanitarian crisis.

The Republicans threaten to impeach the President? What is new, Madam Speaker? Look, you have got to remember, for the first 3 or 4 years he was President, leaders in the Repub-

lican Party—I mean Presidential candidates and entire cable TV networks—questioned the President's own immigration status. We had "birthiers" denying the President was born in America. They questioned whether he was an undocumented immigrant himself. They demanded to see his papers. Now we have "deportation deniers" falsely suggesting President Obama is not enforcing the law. Oh, he is really not deporting people, they say. That is all fake, something Obama, Univision, and Telemundo cooked up.

The President knows the kind of pain that congressional inaction has caused for families and children.

□ 1030

The President wants to be an emancipator, not a deporter, and he will act if he has to. If you give him no choice, this President is going to take charge himself, as well he should.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we offer a lifeline to the Republicans. Let's work together to pass a bill before the President, faced with no other choice, takes action himself. You have 34 legislative days left until July 4, and you had better make good use of them. The American people are waiting.

SUPPORTING AUTISM AWARENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Autism Awareness Month. April is Autism Awareness Month, and today, April 2, is Autism Awareness Day.

Autism is serious. It does not discriminate. People in all racial, socioeconomic, and ethnic groups are impacted. One in 68 children is diagnosed with autism. Let me say it again: one in 68 children. This is a very disturbing statistic.

Mr. Speaker, Florida has a lot of great programs and resources for individuals with autism. The Centers for Autism and Related Disabilities, or CARD, all across the State of Florida will be offering resources and awareness month activities. The Partnership for Effective Programs for Students with Autism pairs teachers and schools with a professional from one of the many CARDS across Florida to assist students with autism. This program's motto is to "provide quality educational programs to students with autism spectrum disorders."

It is the graciousness and generosity of organizations like these and of the individuals involved with them that help in the fight against autism. It is important to raise awareness. It is important to provide programs to assist children and adults with disorders on the autism spectrum. Ultimately, through groups like these and through public and private partnerships, we can continue to work towards a cure.

I am committed to this cause, and I encourage my fellow Members on both

sides of the aisle to get involved. This is an issue that truly overcomes partisan lines. The Light It Up Blue campaign draws awareness for autism as well. Today, thousands of businesses and landmarks will be lit blue. Together, we can shine the light on autism.

ANTHONY P. "TONY" REARDON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Anthony P. "Tony" Reardon, Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. A command navigator from West Palm Beach, Florida, with 1,700 flying hours in the RF-4C, Tony Reardon has excelled both in the cockpit and at the Pentagon. I want to offer him my congratulations on his recent selection as Director of Strategy, Resources and Integration for the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force, International Affairs.

This recent promotion is no surprise to anyone who knows Tony. Throughout his life, he has displayed exceptional leadership and judgment. He graduated in 1977 from Forest Hill High School in West Palm Beach, and even then he was known for his intelligence, his loyalty, and his integrity. He was a drummer in the marching band, a pitcher for the baseball team, and a participant in the American Legion Boys State program, which encourages young people to grow into engaged and responsible citizens.

After graduating from Florida State University in 1981, Tony was selected to attend undergraduate navigator training at Mather Air Force Base in California. He quickly garnered the role of RF-4C instructor weapon systems officer in the 12th Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron at Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas. Tony's talents were needed on the front lines of the cold war, and he was reassigned to Zweibrücken Air Base in Germany. Following the end of the cold war, Tony was transferred back to Bergstrom, where he continued to pass his wealth of knowledge and experience on to the next generation of weapon systems officers.

Realizing his talent for leadership, his commander transferred him to Air Combat Command Headquarters at Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, where he excelled in the Plans and Programs Directorate. After a successful tour, he was once again sent overseas, this time as an air liaison officer at Camp Red Cloud, Korea. Later, he was assigned to Pacific Air Forces Headquarters, returning to the Plans and Programs Directorate at Hickam Air Force Base in Hawaii. After 3 years in Hawaii, he began numerous assignments at Headquarters Air Force at the Pentagon.

As Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of

the Air Force, Tony has supported Air Force leadership by engaging Congress on programs and weapon systems authorizations, constituent inquiries, and other congressional interests. Among some of his more notable accomplishments during his tenure as Deputy Director, Tony prepared the Air Force team for confirmation hearings for the Air Force Secretary, Under Secretary, Chief of Staff, and the Vice Chief of Staff, all in an unprecedented 2-year time frame. He also supported more than 1,500 Air Force senior leader visits to the Hill as well as over 1,000 wing commander Hill visits, more than 450 congressional delegation and congressional staff trips, over 200 congressional hearings, and countless other Air Force Hill engagements.

Today, I would like to wish Mr. Anthony P. "Tony" Reardon good luck and Godspeed in his next assignment as the Director of Strategy, Resources and Integration for the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force, International Affairs. We know that this next chapter of his distinguished career will be one of even more success.

On behalf of the Congress and of the United States of America, I thank Tony; his wife, Dee; and their children, Maggie and Trip, for their patriotism, commitment to country, and service to Nation.

PUERTO RICO: HOW STATEHOOD WOULD POTENTIALLY AFFECT SELECTED FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND REVENUE SOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, this week, the GAO published a report about the fiscal impact of Puerto Rico statehood on the Federal Government.

In a 2012 referendum, a majority of voters in Puerto Rico said they didn't want Puerto Rico to remain a territory, and more voters favored statehood than any other option. In January, at my initiative, a law was enacted to provide funding for the first federally-sponsored vote in Puerto Rico's history. Meanwhile, in the past year, Puerto Rico's longstanding economic problems have devolved into a crisis. Every week, 1,000 of my constituents move to the States in search of opportunity and equality. Thus, the GAO has released its report at a time when island residents are voting for statehood—at the ballot box and with their feet—in unprecedented numbers.

The momentum in favor of statehood continues to build with this report, which supports the conclusion that statehood will be beneficial to Puerto Rico and to the U.S. as a whole.

The report confirms that statehood will enhance the quality of life in Puerto Rico. As a territory, Puerto Rico is treated unequally under key Federal spending and tax credit programs. As a

State, it will receive equal treatment. Based on the GAO's analysis and taking into account programs the GAO did not examine, it can be calculated that statehood will inject an additional \$10 billion into Puerto Rico's economy each year. This underscores the scope and severity of the discrimination Puerto Rico faces as a territory.

The report also alleviates the concern that statehood would have an adverse impact on the U.S. Treasury. As the GAO explains, new Federal outlays to Puerto Rico will be significantly counterbalanced by new Federal revenues generated from the island, which could amount to \$7 billion a year. As Puerto Rico prospers, collections will increase further.

The report, thus, reinforces that statehood, which is so plainly in Puerto Rico's interest, is also in the national interest. This Nation will benefit when Puerto Rico's economy is strong, when its residents don't need to move to the States to achieve their dreams or vote for their national leaders, when individuals and businesses on the island flourish, and when the tax base expands. The U.S. will profit from the state of Puerto Rico's success, just as it currently pays an economic and a moral price for the territory's shortcomings.

The reaction to the report from politicians in Puerto Rico who favor the status quo has been dishonest. Their strategy is clear: if you cannot convince the public, try to confuse the public.

For example, they claim the report concludes that hardworking island residents would have a large Federal tax liability under statehood. The report says no such thing, and the assertion is false. A typical household in Puerto Rico will pay the same or less in total taxes under statehood than it pays now due to the application of Federal tax credits and the ability of the Puerto Rico Government to reduce its high local rates once it no longer needs to finance a disproportionate share of public services.

In any event, this inaccurate argument shows disrespect for the people of Puerto Rico, who will be proud to assume both the rights and responsibilities of statehood. Throughout history, men and women have fought and fallen for equality and dignity. These principles are priceless.

My colleagues who requested the GAO report should now schedule a hearing on it. Seventy-five days have passed since the enactment of the law authorizing Puerto Rico to hold a federally-sponsored referendum, and 132 Members of Congress have sponsored my legislation that calls for a referendum on Puerto Rico's admission as a State, which requires Federal action if a majority of voters chooses statehood. If the Governor of Puerto Rico believes his claim that the GAO report is somehow damaging to statehood, he should have the courage of his convictions to conduct a statehood admission

vote with the available Federal funds without delay. His inaction speaks louder than his words.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Bryan Smith, First Baptist Church Roanoke, Roanoke, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Lord, we thank You for today, for the life that You have given to us, the riches of Your blessings, the freedoms we enjoy, and for Your gracious and tender mercies.

Forgive us for our transgressions against You, and help those gathered here today to work together in the knowledge of Your truth.

I thank You for these leaders who are here by Your authority. Please bless them and their families.

Give to them the wisdom, discernment, humility, and guidance they will need in fulfilling the obligations and responsibilities entrusted to them. May they be quick to hear, slow to speak, and slow to anger.

May their weakness be the revenue for Your strength; may their purpose for gathering today be honorable in Your sight; and may the work that is accomplished promote Your righteousness and peace throughout our Nation.

In Your holy name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COURTNEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. BRYAN SMITH

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to welcome Dr. Bryan Smith, a constituent of the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia and a friend who has offered the opening prayer today. I hope the doctor's prayer offers this body guidance and wisdom for the tasks before us.

Dr. Smith serves as senior pastor of First Baptist Church of Roanoke, one of the largest congregations in Roanoke Valley. During his time at First Baptist, I have known Dr. Smith to be a man who believes in putting faith in action, working tirelessly to help others grow spiritually.

Dr. Smith and his wife, Mary, have served in ministry together for more than 25 years. They have two children. He is a graduate of Mobile College, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, and Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

I want to thank Dr. Smith for serving as guest chaplain in the House of Representatives today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMACARE 30-HOUR RULE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about a young American and one of my constituents from McKinney, Texas, who is doing her best to make a way for herself.

Jillian, a college student, has worked part-time at a local grocery store to help pay for her school expenses. For many years, Jillian clocked between 30 and 40 hours a week until suddenly that was cut down to 15 to 18 hours a week. Jillian learned the cuts were due to ObamaCare.

The new definition of full-time employment is 30 hours instead of the traditional 40 hours. Fewer work hours not only mean less take-home pay, but also less experience and less opportunity.

That is not the America we know and love. That is not the America we want to leave to our children and grandchildren. That is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, to restore the traditional 40-hour workweek and help millions of hardworking Americans like Jillian.

FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, it is here. We have been waiting with bated breath for the Ryan budget, perhaps some of the biggest and most immediate problems confronting our Nation, things that will put people back to work and boost the economy.

For me, number one is the exhaustion of the highway trust fund, meaning, as of October 1 or earlier, the Federal Government will end all new authorization for State highway projects and bridge replacement and transit for 8 to 10 months because the highway trust fund is depleted.

If you look through the Ryan budget, it is the subject of three pages of narrative and is screed full of blather, but a close reading gets to a blueprint for the future of the national transportation system. He has a simple solution. We will end it. We will end it.

The legacy of Dwight David Eisenhower and a coordinated approach to a national transportation system, in the Ryan budget, it ends. He will devolve it, devolve it to the States. The 50 States assembled and the territories will be responsible for funding their own transportation system, and somehow it will serve national needs.

Let's stop this madness.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD'S BACK-
DOOR GOVERNMENT ABORTION
FUNDING

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the government's backdoor funding of abortions through grants to abortion provider Planned Parenthood. Forty-five percent of the organization's entire revenue, totaling roughly \$540 million in 2013, was provided directly by the American taxpayer through government grants.

Planned Parenthood performed 327,000 abortions in 2012. Planned Parenthood states in its own budgetary report for 2013:

We are the most effective advocate in the country for policies that protect access to abortion.

My constituents find the practice of abortion morally abhorrent and threatening to the social fabric of this country, and they should not be forced to subsidize abortions nationwide.

I call on this body to respect the conscience of millions of Americans by ending the practice of government funding for abortions.

RYAN BUDGET

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we learned the details of the Ryan budget, a proposal that would have devastating impacts on my western New York community.

For seniors, the Ryan budget would put Medicare on the road to privatization, handing older Americans a voucher and forcing them to fend for themselves to find quality health care.

This budget slashes Pell grants that provide young people the opportunity for a college education; ends AmeriCorps, a program filling a critical need in urban schools and neighborhoods; and eliminates all support for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Ryan budget would gut domestic priorities such as infrastructure, education, and medical research, cutting nation-building here by \$791 billion in less than a decade.

A budget is the clearest message of a nation's values. The Ryan budget abandons seniors, students, patients awaiting medical breakthroughs, and struggling families. This is not who we are as a nation.

MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Month of the Military Child, which is celebrated every April.

For generations, military children have supported those who serve by making their own sacrifices and persevering through tough times, especially those in families with parents on Active Duty or deployment.

For a child, there are few things more difficult than being apart from a mom or dad deployed overseas. Just since 2001, nearly 2 million military children have experienced a parental deployment. Currently, there are approximately 1.2 million children of Active Duty U.S. members worldwide.

Sometimes overlooked, military families move three times as often as non-military families and share many of the hardships. Children and spouses in these circumstances also experience anxiety in higher rates than their non-military counterparts and must worry about new housing, jobs, friends, and schools.

With a son and daughter-in-law in the military, I know life in the service can be trying, but we thank these soldiers and their families for keeping us safe.

Mr. Speaker, let us give praise to these soldiers and their families for their service and their sacrifice. They deserve as much.

CONNECTICUT PRE-ENGINEERING PROGRAM

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a group of five talented students from Danbury. These students, part of the Connecticut Pre-Engineering Program at Danbury High School, won Best in State in the second annual Verizon Innovative App Challenge.

With the guidance of their teacher advisers, Jack Tracey and Linda Kimble, they created an app, Mediminder, that reminds people to refill their prescriptions and provides them with their doctor's contact information.

As a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and as a cofounder of the congressional student app competition, I am a strong believer in hands-on opportunities like this. In fact, this weekend, I will be hosting an app workshop in Waterbury.

When students create and design their own app, they transform from passive consumers of technology into active innovators, problem solvers, and entrepreneurs.

Tommy, Anjali, Lexie, Steven, and Sameena, I applaud your innovative spirit. Congratulations on winning Best in State. I can't wait to see what you come up with next.

HONORING DR. FERNANDEZ FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEDICINE IN SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions of Dr. Bernardo "Bernie" Fernandez to medicine in south Florida.

Dr. Fernandez will soon assume the post of CEO of Baptist Medical Health Group, and he is an accomplished doctor with a record of success as CEO of Cleveland Clinic Florida. His leadership in the field of medicine earned him the distinction of being named one of America's best doctors and the title of Fellow at the American College of Physicians and the Society for Vascular Medicine and Biology.

Dr. Fernandez has given back to the south Florida community by actively participating in charitable groups and supporting our shared alma mater, the University of Miami. However, none of this is done in a vacuum and is only accomplished with the love and support of his wife, Rosy, and their children, Steven and Cristina.

Again, I congratulate Bernie for his leadership, and I know that our south

Florida community will continue to benefit from his more than 25 years of experience. Congratulations to Bernie.

HEALTH INSURANCE SIGN-UPS SURGE

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, these are heady days in the State of Connecticut where both the UConn men and women are in the Final Four, shocking the world.

Mr. Speaker, there has also been another team working hard in the State of Connecticut. That is the assisters, navigators, insurance agents, community health centers, faith-based groups, and call center employees who have been enrolling Connecticut citizens in the Affordable Care Act at a frantic pace.

As of Monday night, they had enrolled 197,000 Connecticut citizens. Even though the target that HHS gave last summer was only 100,000, they doubled the target that was given to the State of Connecticut. Why? Because these assisters, like Marianne Martinez, said:

I heard a lot of stories from people who hadn't had insurance or seen a doctor in years. Some people came in expecting insurance would cost them \$500 a month, and it turned out to be only \$40 or \$100. It was a breath of fresh air.

Congratulations to all those individuals who are helping, helping people in this country get access to health care. And go, Huskies.

ADMINISTRATION RELEASES DANGEROUS CRIMINAL ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration claims historic record deportation numbers, but a recent report by the Center for Immigration Studies found that immigration agents only attempted to send home about one-fourth of the illegal immigrants they encountered in 2014, and 68,000 of those released back into our communities have criminal records.

When the administration puts criminal illegal immigrants back in our neighborhoods, it can have tragic results. Not only do these illegal immigrants take jobs from unemployed Americans, but they also pose a threat to the safety of innocent Americans.

These dangerous criminal illegal immigrants are likely to repeat their offenses. In 2012, the Congressional Research Service determined that over 26,000 illegal immigrants were re-arrested almost 58,000 times. Suspected crimes included theft, robbery, and murder.

The President's immigration policy threatens the safety and lives of thousands of Americans.

□ 1215

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the severe impact of climate change across the United States.

On Sunday, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a new report, laying out the ways that climate change has already impacted our economy.

Climate change threatens our coastal communities through ocean acidification and sea level rise. It threatens our big cities by making extreme weather events, like Hurricane Sandy, more frequent and more intense. It threatens all of us who rely on rain to water our crops or on snow for our drinking water.

California faces a future where less snow and earlier snowmelt will strain our already scarce water resources. 2014 is already one of the driest years in our State's history. Who knows what 2015 will bring?

I call on all of my colleagues to come together in a meaningful and bipartisan way to tackle climate change.

RYAN BUDGET PROTECTS DEFENSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, House Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN unveiled his vision of a budget, which will reduce Washington's out-of-control spending and will put our country back on a path to prosperity.

For years, the President has targeted our military in order to support his Big Government agenda. Last month, the administration announced plans to reduce the size of our Armed Forces to levels of those prior to World War II, putting American families at risk.

Chairman RYAN recognizes that our brave men and women in uniform, military families, and veterans are the ones who dedicate their lives to keeping us safe. His budget proposes to strengthen national security.

The primary function of the national government is to maintain a strong national defense. I appreciate Chairman PAUL RYAN for committing to ensuring the safety of every American at home and abroad.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

RYAN BUDGET

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the draconian

budget proposal released by House Republicans yesterday.

In Las Vegas and across the country, Americans have made it clear that our budget should bolster a strong middle class and make serious investments in the next generation.

This Republican proposal, however, shrinks investments in infrastructure and education, cuts funding to research and development, eliminates the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens, and breaks the longtime promise to seniors by, once again, attacking the Medicare guarantee. These cuts undermine our short-term recovery, and they shortchange critical investments that will keep us competitive in the global economy.

In short, Republicans ignore solid American values, instead doubling down on inconsistent assumptions and budget gimmicks that just do not add up. This budget should have been released on Groundhog Day, but I guess that April Fool's Day is just as appropriate.

I say to you: Don't be fooled.

REMEMBERING RAY HUTCHISON— A TEXAS ICON

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Ray Hutchison, husband to our colleague, former Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, a great Texan and an even better friend.

Through his work in developing nearly every public works project in our area in the past 50 years, Ray Hutchison is leaving a lasting mark on the north Texas community. He was a driving force in creating the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport, one of the largest airports in the country today, as well as developing the Dallas Area Rapid Transit system. He also contributed to several professional sporting facilities in the area. We can thank Ray Hutchison for moving the Washington Senators to Arlington in the early 1970s, giving us our beloved team, the Texas Rangers.

Ray's selflessness and abundant accomplishments are too great to list in just 1 minute, but I am proud to have known him. On behalf of the Texas delegation, I offer my sincerest condolences to former Senator Hutchison and to her children, Bailey and Houston.

DISCHARGE PETITION FOR BIPARTISAN, COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last week, I signed the discharge petition on H.R. 15, the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Today, I stand with millions of families across our country to call upon Speaker BOEHNER to simply bring H.R. 15 to the floor of the House for a vote. This bill secures our borders, provides an earned pathway to citizenship, and increases economic opportunity for all Americans. We request a vote—no, we demand a vote. We demand a vote, Mr. Speaker.

We demand this vote because the American people are tired of living under a broken immigration system and seeing families broken apart. The American people know that passing this bill will save our country \$900 billion over the next two decades. We know that the American people overwhelmingly support immigration reform with a path to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, give the American people that vote.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, not only is April National Autism Awareness Month, but more specifically, today, April 2, is World Autism Awareness Day. Today, we join with families all across the world in a sign of support, unity, and encouragement.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, nearly one in 68 babies born will be diagnosed with some degree of autism. Families dealing with autism are in all of our districts, and they are in our communities. They are our neighbors, and they are our families and friends. Yet far too little awareness and support occurs for these families that are raising an autistic child.

April is one more opportunity to spread the word and remind others about autism, and to raise awareness about the importance of research and advocacy for Americans who are living with developmental disabilities. Families dealing with autism bear their challenges admirably and lovingly, raising children into adults who contribute to our country in so many ways. Today, we celebrate those families and their many accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize April as National Autism Awareness Month.

RYAN BUDGET PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Republicans released their budget blueprint to the American people.

Budgets are moral documents that reflect our priorities as a nation. Republicans have clearly outlined their priorities in this budget, which are:

raising taxes on the middle class, cutting taxes for multimillionaires, and hurting seniors by ending Medicare as we know it. The budget plan introduced this week offers no real solutions.

If your thing is massive cuts to nutrition, health care, and other critical supports that give low-income children and families a decent chance at life, then the Ryan budget is your deal.

Instead of making these hits on the middle class, we should focus on improving education, investing in domestic manufacturing, and paving the way for a good future.

Also troubling is that the Ryan budget rejects the opportunity to enact immigration reform, to raise the minimum wage, and to extend unemployment insurance, which would create jobs and strengthen our economy.

As elected leaders, we owe it to the American people to invest in them, not to cut the safety net from under them.

MARFA, TEXAS

(Mr. GALLEGOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, today, in my 23-in-1 journey, I would like to take you to a beautiful city in West Texas known as Marfa.

Established in 1883 as a water stop for the railroad, Marfa has become a cultural mixing bowl, with cowboys and artists alike. Located in the Trans-Pecos area at an altitude of over 4,800 feet and situated on what is known as the Marfa Plateau, it is surrounded by a beautiful landscape that has served as the backdrop to many notable movies, like the film "Giant," starring James Dean and Elizabeth Taylor.

Despite having a population of only 2,000 people, Marfa has become a hidden cultural hub in the desert. It is a place filled with cowboys and art galleries, Mexican food and Texas barbecue.

In Marfa, you will find one of the most beautiful, historic courthouses in Texas. The antelope literally play amongst the rich outdoor art, and the tourists come to relax, surrounded by big city culture in a town with only one traffic light.

In Marfa, the old crashes with the new to form a harmony that is truly American. I am honored to represent a city so rich in art, cultural life, and history. Mr. Speaker, I invite everyone to Marfa.

AN AFFRONT TO DEMOCRACY

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's conservative majority has decided the very wealthiest Americans should now be allowed to have even more influence in politics to advance their personal or political or business agendas.

The Court has allowed even more money into campaigns, and this threatens to drown out the voices of ordinary citizens.

Today's Supreme Court McCutcheon decision is the worst affront to democracy since Citizens United. Congress must take action.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, just give us a vote. Just give us a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

The United States Senate passed a bill almost a year ago, in a bipartisan fashion, on comprehensive immigration reform. Americans want comprehensive immigration reform.

We have a bill, H.R. 15, which provides for comprehensive immigration reform. It would pass this House, but for some reason or another, the Republican majority will not bring it up. It will not allow the House to vote on it.

The Senate had the courage to vote on it. The House ought to bring this up and pass comprehensive immigration reform. It can be done this week or next week. Let's get it done. Just give us a vote.

FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the other week, I met with leaders of the San Diego medical research community, who had a unified message: we need to end the cuts in research that have slowed medical innovation for the last decade.

I am proud to be leading the bipartisan effort, along with nearly 200 of my colleagues, to push for over \$32 billion in Federal funding for the NIH.

This is a very personal issue. Almost all of us know someone who is struggling with a disease for which the National Institutes of Health funding is used to find a cure. That person could be a mother, a father, a family friend or, even more heart-wrenching, a child. The disease could be cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, MS, or any of the other diseases that people face every day.

It is more than a matter of scientific research; it is a matter of economics. For a generation, California has been a world leader in life sciences innovation, and our State is home to the most jobs, to the most companies, to the world's greatest concentration of top-tier research institutions. It is time to reverse the budget cuts that threaten this ecosystem and to increase the NIH budget to \$32 billion.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, all across America and around the world, the men and women in the United States military serve us and serve us well.

Would you wonder whether or not their families back home would be eligible for an increase in the minimum wage?

Their families may be blue-collar workers or workers in the service industries, and here they are, willing to sacrifice their lives, and we here in the United States Congress won't raise the minimum wage to \$10.10. What an outrage. Even the possible compromise that is percolating around has the audacity to suggest that \$7.25 is okay, that we will raise it just a little bit. But you don't understand the facts: \$10.10 is over a 3-year period.

Then today, on the floor of the House, a brilliant idea. H.R. 2575, I believe is the name. This one wants to eliminate the opportunity of those who are working 30 hours a week to get health care. Across the way, in the Budget hearing, the Republican budget is cutting trillions of dollars in social services and Medicaid.

Raise the minimum wage. Take the American people off of social needs, social assistance. Stop the tomfoolery of turning this country backwards.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2575, SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 530 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 530

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2575) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 530 provides for consideration of a critical piece of legislation passed out of the Ways and Means Committee designed to address a critical flaw in the Affordable Care Act, which is causing workers to lose hours at their job and thus lose wages to help put food on their tables and feed their families and pay their utility bills to heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer.

H.R. 2575, the bipartisan Save American Workers Act of 2014, fixes this flaw by changing the newly created labor rule in the Affordable Care Act, which defines full-time work at 30 hours per week and places that definition back where the American public has always believed it to be, at 40 hours per week.

The rule before us today provides for 3 hours of debate. That is triple the standard hour of debate that most bills before this body receive. This is done in order to fully discuss this important labor issue affecting so many Americans.

To maintain this targeted focus—the exact kind of fix that the President claims he is interested in discussing with Republicans in order to make his law more workable—no amendments were made in order. This allows the House to fully debate this crucial issue without the possibility of unrelated issues being brought into the debate.

Indeed, this bill is so targeted, dealing with one single provision in the Affordable Care Act, that it does not repeal the Affordable Care Act—a charge I have no doubt we will hear several times over today—but in fact simply changes a definition in the bill.

Moreover, during the markup of this legislation in the Ways and Means Committee, no amendments were offered by either the majority or the minority. As always, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Affordable Care Act's requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance coverage to those employees working 30 or more hours a week, employers across the Nation—from schools to universities to municipalities to restaurants—are being forced to cut workers' hours or face unsustainable employment costs to their businesses and organizations.

As we are seeing—and indeed, as many on this side predicted prior to the controversial and contentious passage of the Affordable Care Act—the bill fundamentally changed labor law in this country, creating a new standard called the 30-hour workweek, a standard 30-hour workweek, a shorter workweek than even imposed by the country of France.

As a result, workers' hours are being cut and productivity in this country, a country that has always prided itself on the work ethic of its citizens, will decrease over time. This is what an onerous government regulation can and will do—suppress innovation and disadvantage our businesses.

Many members of the Democratic Party have been outspoken in clamoring for an extension to long-term unemployment benefits, which would extend government assistance to unemployed Americans well beyond a year's worth of benefits; yet there is something that can be done today which will have the actual, practical effect of putting more money into people's pockets.

We have heard story after story, from every State in the Union, that employers are dropping workers from even 39 hours per week to 29 or fewer hours, potentially 10 work hours a week that workers won't see in their paychecks, which could mean hundreds or more dollars that men and women won't have to feed their families or pay their bills. Increasing workers' hours increases the money that people have in their disposable income.

The Affordable Care Act fundamentally changed labor law in this country, and the repercussions of this might not be felt for years to come. This is indeed the prototype of the dangerous, slippery slope.

What other labor laws will be reinterpreted to define full-time employment at 30 hours per week? Do people intend to impose overtime rules on employers who employ people for over 30 hours per week? It is yet another regulation which would only result in businesses cutting more hours.

What will the National Labor Relations Board reinterpret, knowing that the very fabric of labor law is based on a 30-hour workweek, instead of that previously established standard of 40 hours per week?

Prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, employers were already overwhelmingly providing health insurance to their employees working 40 hours a week.

Making the change contained in Mr. YOUNG's legislation will cause the least amount of disruption in the labor market, and I would submit, with the economy as it is today, making the least disruptive change in the labor market would be desirable.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the total number of hours worked by about 1.5 percent to 2 percent during the period from 2017 to

2024. This is almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor.

Because of this, the Congressional Budget Office projects a decline in the number of workers of about 2 million in 2017, rising to about 2.5 million in 2024, all as a net result of the Affordable Care Act.

The latest Congressional Budget Office figures show that the Affordable Care Act will increase spending by almost \$2 trillion—double the estimate from 2010. The Joint Committee on Taxation states that taxpayers will be on the hook for another \$1.1 trillion over the next decade.

Americans earning as little as \$25,000 a year will pay more because of the law, even after accounting for the \$1 trillion in premium cost-sharing subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about what is happening here today. This bill before us does not repeal the President's takeover of health care in this country. It does not undermine the Affordable Care Act.

It does not take health insurance from a single person in the country. It is a fix to a fatal flaw contained within the law, similar to the seven fixes that have passed both Houses of Congress and were signed into law by the President.

Does anyone miss the 1099 paperwork regulation, which was repealed early on after the passage of the Affordable Care Act? Does anyone legitimately miss the CLASS Act, which was repealed on the very last day of the last Congress?

I think not. Had I not reminded you of those two parts of the bill, I doubt you would remember them.

This is no different from those 37 unilateral fixes that the President and his Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Treasury have made on their own, with no input from either legislative body. It is a fix to stop legislation that will cause people to lose their work.

If all sides cannot agree to fix a provision within the Affordable Care Act that is preventing people from working, then it is simply empty rhetoric to claim that the President or the other body or this body is interested in any fixes at all.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against the 52nd closed rule and the 52nd attempt to dismantle the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

Once again, my colleagues in the Republican Party are standing on the wrong side of history. In 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed an ambitious program called Social Se-

curity in order to ensure that America's seniors had a measure of financial safety in their old age, a floor through which they could not fall; yet as it was being debated in the halls of Congress, Republicans and their allies in the business community tried to portray Social Security as something far more sinister.

Representative Daniel Reed of New York predicted that, under Social Security, Americans would feel "the lash of the dictator," while Republican Senator Daniel Hastings of Delaware declared that Social Security would "end the progress of a great country."

Republican Congressman John Taber even said of the proposed law:

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery and to enslave workers.

Thirty years later, these same arguments are being used to decry the creation of Medicare as the beginning of socialized medicine, and it was strictly with the votes of Democrats that the legislation to create Medicare was passed out of the Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee before being brought to the floor.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been through this same story many times. A cynical person might believe that one of the reasons that the ACA has been fought so hard, as this is the third time Republicans failed to come up with any program that would help Americans either achieve independence or security in their old age, is that since every one of them voted against it, it is in their best interest that it fail.

All those claims that were made were absolutely untrue; and today, despite the current majority's attempts to portray the Affordable Care Act as another law that will steal personal freedoms, destroy the economy, and hurt American workers, the facts are once again proving them wrong.

Instead, it is quickly becoming clear that the Affordable Care Act will stand alongside Social Security and Medicare as an enduring commitment to the welfare of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, our Nation had reached the depths of a crisis that was decades in the making.

In fact, Presidents dating back as far as Harry Truman, including Republicans like Richard Nixon and Democrats like Bill Clinton, saw the urgent need to reform our health care system and expand coverage to every American, yet each time that a President tried to act, their efforts failed.

As a result, by 2010, our Nation was spending 17.6 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product on health care, and yet a record high number of 49.9 million Americans had no care at all.

With the health care crisis more acute than ever, President Obama and Democrats in Congress decided that we had to act. In fact, the percentage of GDP that health care was consuming

was rising beyond 18 percent, causing a serious threat to our economy. Thus began one of the most comprehensive legislative debates in history, a debate that included the views of both Democrats and Republicans, since they occupy all committees, and a debate conducted in full view of the American people.

The House held nearly 100 hours of hearings and 83 hours of committee markups. We heard from 181 witnesses, and 239 amendments from both Democrats and Republicans were considered in the three committees of jurisdiction, and 121 of them were adopted.

□ 1245

Finally, the bill was available for 72 hours before Members were asked to vote on it on the House floor. Despite this thorough and collaborative process, not a single member of the Republican Party on this floor voted for the historic law, true to their pattern of decades.

Today, thanks exclusively to the votes of Democrats, the numbers of Americans with access to health care is going up, and most importantly, the cost to providing health care to our citizens is slowing down. We have seen the slowest growth in the rise of health care in these last 2 years than we have in 50 years.

We all know that 7.2 million Americans registered for health insurance this year through the online health care exchanges—and even more in State exchanges, and we don't have that number yet. Indeed, RAND put out a report this week stating that 20 million Americans are benefiting, including the number of children under 26 who are on their parents' health care insurance. So, this week, in addition to that, the Los Angeles Times said at least 9.5 million previously uninsured Americans now have health insurance because of the ACA.

For those of us who have been carrying health insurance and been lucky enough to have it from our employers, each of our policies have cost \$1,000 more because of what we were having to pay for uncompensated care for those who had no health insurance. That alone is one measure that is going to reduce the cost of insurance.

In the face of its success, it is not surprising the majority has come here today with a 52nd attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. After unanimously opposing its passage, spending millions of dollars campaigning against it, the majority has firmly planted their feet on the wrong side of history. Their only way forward is to dismantle the ACA as quickly as possible and prevent the American people from seeing more benefits under the law.

Mr. Speaker, even though the majority may claim that today's legislation is an attempt to fix the Affordable Care Act, it is, in fact, a fiscally irresponsible attempt to undermine the law. First, the legislation is not paid for,

which flies in the face of the rules of all the Republicans in the House. The bill costs \$74 million, and there is no hint at all of how that is going to be paid for. In fact, the Rules Committee last night, as it may, waived the rules of the House that require a pay-for, despite denying countless similar waiver requests in the past.

According to analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, this legislation would increase the deficit by \$74 billion and force 1 million people to lose their sponsored health care coverage and increase the number of uninsured. It is not true that under this piece of legislation no one would lose their health care.

Over the next few hours, we will surely hear many claims about how much we care about the American worker. And I have no doubt that each claim contains a measure of truth because, after all, those American workers are our constituents. Words, no matter how moving, are only as powerful as the actions that are taken to back them up. It is the vote we take, not the speeches we make, that will show how much we care for the well-being of the American people.

Will we continue the progress being made under the Affordable Care Act, progress that is providing millions of Americans with access to health care for the very first time, or will we vote to try and undermine the progress with a bill that is before us today?

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule and the underlying legislation. The facts become clearer every day. The Affordable Care Act is delivering on its promise of lower cost, greater access to lifesaving health care for millions of Americans. Millions, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, have health care because they had been born with a preexisting condition which no longer hampers their having health care.

It is time the majority stop playing political games and start supporting the historic law that will benefit Americans now and for generations to come. As I have pointed out many times on the floor during a rule, running the House of Representatives of the Congress costs \$24 million a week. This is again another week where we do nothing to earn that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds for a response.

Of course, the President did come out for a big photo op and press conference in the Rose Garden yesterday and talked about a number of 7 million. Discounted in that is the 6 million people who lost their health insurance in October, November, and December of last year who have now, thankfully, reclaimed insurance.

So, the actual numbers, we will see those posted later in the year; but isn't it interesting, the President can have a press conference, but they cannot provide our committee with the actual detail on those numbers, which we have been asking for for months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the rule and on, also, the underlying bill, the Save American Workers Act.

Four years after ObamaCare's passage, this law's implementation is a patchwork of delays stitched together with miles of bureaucratic red tape. Unfortunately, the arbitrary delays and the exemptions this administration has granted help only a small segment of workers and businesses. Part-time workers have been among those most deeply affected by ObamaCare, yet this administration has shown little interest in providing the relief to these folks that is extended to unions and favored business entities.

It was said just a moment ago that this is the 52nd time that we are doing something like this, but I will say this: I will stand on the side of history that says for 52 times it will stand to stand against something that is wrong. I will stand in this well 52 more times when it is wrong and hurting the American people. Right is right, and this bill is wrong.

The underlying bill seeks to help moms and dads, businesses understand what we have always known. ObamaCare's 30-hour definition of full-time employee demonstrates how little the authors of the bill know about running a business. The vast majority of American employers and employees have understood full time as being 40 hours a week for nearly a century. It is time to replace ObamaCare's definition of full-time employee with one that makes sense and will help American workers meet their financial goals.

As an original cosponsor of the Save American Workers Act, I stand with all those in Georgia's Ninth District whose livelihood has been impacted by ObamaCare's definition of a full-time employee. These include employees of the City of Gainesville, which is limiting workers' hours to avoid ObamaCare's employer mandate. Reduced hours make a tremendous impact on the household budgets of the men and women serving the people of Gainesville. While many of these folks have had the option of working additional hours to make ends meet in the past, they must now seek employment elsewhere or find a second job.

Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that is not unique. We have heard similar stories from both the private and public sector told in this Chamber. It is time for this administration and its allies to stop writing off these realities as lies or untruths being circulated for political purposes.

Those who still stand by ObamaCare need to spend some time face-to-face with the workers whose hours have been cut because of this law. It is time for them to look in the eyes of a mom and dad who won't have as much time with their children this year because

they will have to take on yet another job to make ends meet.

I hope my fair-minded colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together to support this commonsense legislation and provide some relief to the folks who deserve it most—America's working men and women.

The gentlewoman from New York is right; it is about our votes, not our speeches. The American people can look to the Republican majority and they can see whom we stand with. We stand with the people who have been hurt, who are suffering, who are having to work extra jobs. It is about those moms and dads. It is not about the exemptions and special privileges given to friends of this administration on the delays and a whim and a notice.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow New Yorker, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak with respect to the previous question. I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we could vote on H.R. 1010, a bill that would raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour over a 3-year period.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't get it. I don't understand what the problem is. We are the people's House. More than 70 percent of the American people have indicated that they support an increase in the minimum wage. This isn't a partisan issue. Majorities of Republicans, Democrats, and unaffiliateds all support an increase in the minimum wage by overwhelming numbers.

There are studies that indicate that if we increase the minimum wage, we will pump \$35 billion into the economy over a 3-year span of phasing it in. That is \$35 billion worth of economic activity without spending a dime of Federal money. That economic activity, it is estimated, would create 85,000 jobs.

Again, I will say, I don't get it. This Congress ought to be about creating jobs. Here is an opportunity to do that without spending a dime of Federal money, and yet we can't even get a vote.

While we're here in this Chamber, the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican budget resolution, is being marked up. That budget resolution seeks to cut \$135 billion out of the SNAP program over the next 10 years. In order for that cut to be effective, if it were to ever take on the force of law, millions of people would lose their SNAP eligibility.

But get this, if we raise the minimum wage, it has been estimated that we would save \$4.6 billion a year, in other words, roughly \$50 billion over 10 years in SNAP costs because people would be making more money and, thus, have their eligibility for SNAP reduced. Isn't it preferable to help people earn more money and reduce their dependence on Federal programs?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be vastly preferable to reduce Federal expenditures for a safety net program by virtue of lifting the economic status of the people that received them? Isn't that what we should be doing, trying to lift people up and give them opportunity as opposed to taking away from them benefits that they very badly need and benefits that they need because the jobs they have are such low-wage jobs?

All we are asking for is a vote. We simply want a vote. The previous speaker said that we were sent here to vote. That is right. We were sent here to vote. This is a very simple, straightforward provision. It used to get passed with bipartisan support. All we are asking for is a vote. If Members don't support the measure, vote against it. Let the American people know where they stand. But if Members do support it, they should have the opportunity to vote for it; and hopefully, giving us that opportunity, we will pass it so that we can help lift people up without spending a dime of Federal money.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, really, today's legislation is simple. It is about protecting American workers from job-destroying regulations contained in the Affordable Care Act. As written, ObamaCare establishes a definition of full-time employees as anyone working 30 hours per week and requires that business provide each of these workers with employer-sponsored health care or to pay a penalty.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here for is not the minimum wage today; that is another time. I am sure that as the other body debates this and as the administration trots around the country opportunities to sell their end of that, the American people will get that message. Today, this is about a group of people who are arbitrarily losing and having diminished from 40 hours down to 30 hours their work, their job, directly as a result of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in testimony before the House of Representatives, there was discussion about a Hoover Institution study that was done by Dr. Chen. Dr. Chen specifically went and looked at the impact that the Affordable Care Act was having upon employers and employees. This really was put into context when we realized that this is a net \$74 billion change in the law—\$74 billion that the administration was counting on American people paying into the Affordable Care Act to support this by diminishing the amount of hours that a person works.

So, what did Dr. Chen say? Dr. Chen took just one part of our marketplace—education. Here is what he said:

The final reason I argue the 30-hour rule must be addressed is because of the negative impact it is having—in this case—on school districts, colleges, and universities. The analysis of vul-

nerable workers referenced earlier was that we focused on 225,000 workers who have a history of working in the education industry.

And they found out that, because of the 30-hour rule, that over 100 school districts across the country, including dozens in Indiana, which is where the study took place, would have either cut workers' hours or outsourced jobs to avoid the Affordable Care Act's employee mandate.

□ 1300

What we are saying is that the Federal law—which is not a mistake; it is on purpose—was specifically designed to bring \$74 billion to the Affordable Care Act by diminishing the hours that the American worker can have. And when we bring this to the floor, they are arguing, oh, my gosh; Republicans, they want to have a \$74 billion higher deficit. It could not be further from the truth. This is money that comes from American workers, \$74 billion. And this commonsense legislation that we are handling today will say that we are going to turn back the clock to where there will not be a penalty for having a 40-hour workweek in America.

Today, the Democratic Party and President Obama want to reduce the number of hours that an American worker will have and take \$74 billion off, diminishing what would be in their pockets, to move it directly to the Federal Government.

No doubt you will see other Democrats come to the floor, just as we saw the gentleman from New York, arguing not about the substance of this bill but talking about why we ought to do a minimum wage bill. Yet their same arguments are, we should have a government that allows people to keep more money in their pockets. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing today.

We are with a commonsense bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) carefully, thoughtfully went and sold this bill across this body, a bipartisan bill to say that the \$74 billion impact on the middle class of this country—in particular, universities, those in education, those workers who needed jobs—will lose, in essence, one-fourth of the hours that they have worked because of the Affordable Care Act, President Barack Obama, NANCY PELOSI, and HARRY REID, who jammed this bill down the American people's throats. And now Republicans are taking it on one at a time. This is our 51st slice at explaining to the American people why this is a bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, the \$74 billion belongs to the American worker, not to bigger government. The \$74 billion is exactly why the Republican Party is here today. And I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who has worked not only on the Rules Committee but also in Energy and Commerce, for taking his private sector experience as a doctor to Washington, D.C. Having a doctor in the House, as

Dr. BURGESS has done, makes a huge difference. That is why the Republican Party is on the floor today saying, let's pass this piece of legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act hit a significant milestone yesterday: over 7 million people signed up for health care. I was very proud of it. I voted for the Affordable Care Act.

I suffered a debilitating illness when I was 5 years old, and my father was a doctor, but, beyond that, just knowing human beings and the need for health care, it was so important for me to see that people got health care. Fifty million Americans don't have it.

It was a great day when we gave the opportunity to these 7 million people, plus the many people that got Medicaid extended to them in States where the Governors were responsible and are accepting money to provide health care to people who needed it, while some other States are not, and the children who are able to stay on their parents' health care until they are 26. We are talking over 7 million people. When you add in the children and the Medicaid folks, it is a lot more people. It is a day America should be celebrating. It boggles my mind to see the other side bringing, for the 51st or 52nd time, a bill to repeal what is an effort to give 10 million Americans, or more, health care. We should be celebrating.

What you do unto the least of these, you do unto me. Health care is an essential basic element of life, and if you don't have health care, you are not going to have a fruitful and long life.

So I celebrate the passage of the bill and am in bewilderment at the fact that the Republicans are proudly having a 51st or 52nd opportunity to attack what is a bill that gives health care to people; gives parents the knowledge that their children are getting health care; gives children the relief that their parents, when they have illnesses, will be treated; and that nobody will be shut out because they have a pre-existing condition. Being a woman won't be treated as a preexisting condition, and insurers will not be allowed to deny them health care because of their gender. The doughnut hole will be filled. This is a day to celebrate.

Above the Speaker's rostrum, DANIEL WEBSTER says: Let's do something great in our time here. Well, we did it, and we need to be proud of it.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a very important point of what we are doing here today—look, when the junior Senator from my State stands up back home and says that he wants to repeal every syllable of ObamaCare, I will stand on my chair and cheer because I think that is the right approach.

But that is not what we are doing today. We are fixing a problem, as it

exists in the body of the law, that is redefining full-time work as 30 hours per week. We are fundamentally reestablishing the relationship that occurs with America's working class.

Now, I would submit that in Politico magazine, on March 26, 2014, there was an opinion piece written, "How to Fix the Affordable Care Act." And who was this opinion piece written by? Well, it was written by Members of the other body, Democratic Senators who had voted in favor of the passage of the Affordable Care Act in the first place. But they have proposals that they put forward in an opinion piece on how to fix the Affordable Care Act.

One of the things they say is, maybe we ought to allow selling across State lines. Maybe we ought to allow for a catastrophic policy to be sold again because that has, after all, been prohibited under the Affordable Care Act. They are valid suggestions. They are trying to fix the problems contained within the Affordable Care Act because they recognize it is unsustainable and unmanageable. Perhaps they are a little bit embarrassed because each one of them was the 60th vote that allowed the Affordable Care Act to come back over to the House and be passed.

Now, today we are talking about a fix to a problem within the Affordable Care Act that allows full-time employment to be reestablished and redefined at 40 hours per week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. Your colleague always has more speakers as long as he is seated in the House. But I see no one else waiting, so we can proceed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I am prepared to close and yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we heard, again, today that the Affordable Care Act has caused a lot of job loss, which simply flies in the face of reality because since the bill was passed, 8.6 million new jobs have been created in the United States. And every time we see one of those ads where somebody says, oh, I couldn't do this, I couldn't do that because of the health care bill, we have discovered that, generally, oftentimes people have been paid to say that on ads or that they have, unfortunately, been mistaken.

Now, today's rule grants 3 hours of debate on a bill going nowhere because we don't have anything else to do. We all know that the Senate will never take up this legislation, and if it did, the President has already said he would veto it. So instead of wasting 3 hours of debate on a 52nd attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act, I urge my colleagues to finally hold a vote to reform our immigration system, renew unemployment benefits, raise the minimum wage, or create jobs.

This economy would be roaring if we could pass some of our bills. We have 48

bills ready to go that would create new jobs that we can't put on the floor because of our single occupation here of trying to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

So if we defeat the previous question today—and I hope everybody will vote "no" on it—it will give us a chance to do something that cries out to be done.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour. The American people are calling for an economy that works for everyone, not just for those at the top.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the underlying bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to the issue of jobs created in the last 5 years, let me point out that the State of Texas has been responsible for the creation of about one-third of those jobs. It is our robust oil and gas business and the manufacturing sector in the State of Texas that have been responsible for that job growth.

So when the President comes in front of a joint session of Congress for the State of the Union address and wants to talk about the jobs created since he became President, my belief is, he should say in the next statement, May God bless Texas, because Texas is responsible for that job growth, and it had nothing to do with the Affordable Care Act.

Let me talk briefly about why we are here today. Of course the gentlelady mentioned about the passage of the Affordable Care Act. She mentioned the detailed analysis that was done by Democrats, who were then in the majority, how they pored over every word in the legislation.

Let me read you the paragraph that is under question today. I am reading from section 1513 of the consolidated Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act: "The number of full-time employees for any month otherwise determined include for such month a number of employees determined by dividing the aggregate number of hours of service of employees who are not full-time employees for the month by 120." Period, end of sentence.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Well, fortunately, we don't have to wonder what it means because we have a rule that was promulgated by the Department of the Treasury which came out this past February. It is about a 55-page rule based upon what I just read

to the House. It is a long recitation. It contains a lot of things, but here is the bottom line: For employees who average at least 30 hours of service per week during a measurement period, who thus must be treated as full-time employees during an associated 6-month stability period. That is the bottom line.

I don't know how we went from 120 per month to 30 hours per week, but they figured it out at the Department of Treasury at some great expense, I rather suspect, because here is this rule that came to the American people in February of this year when the actual law was passed almost 4 years prior. Nevertheless, we have the rule, and people are welcome to read it in the Federal Register. It was published on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, 2 days before Valentine's Day. We love you, America.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that governs the debate on this bill before us today keeps that fundamental contract with employers and their workers that full-time employment will be 40 weeks. If you accept the definition from the Department of Labor that it is now 30 weeks and an employer is trying to reduce the cost of providing employment, they may make the logical assumption that if someone only works 28 or 29 hours, then they are not full-time; therefore, they do not need to be providing health insurance.

And what we have done is, we have shifted that entire equation and robbed people of 10 hours of employment every week. That is a significant change in their take-home pay.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of a critical bill to ensure that Americans are not forced to work fewer hours than they otherwise would without these draconian labor laws included in the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1315

I want to thank Mr. YOUNG for his thoughtful legislation, working across the aisle to offer a bill that both Republicans and Democrats have accepted in the committee by passing it through the committee with no amendments. He has bipartisan cosponsors, and he has public support.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2575, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2014," which represents the 52nd attempt by House Republicans to impede the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

I oppose this bill because its effect would be to deny employer provided health insurance to hard working employees who work more than 30 hours but less than 40 hours per week.

If this bill were to become law in its current form, the health security of 10.2 percent of the workforce, or approximately 19.8 million workers, would be placed at risk.

I offered two amendments to H.R. 2575 that would prevent this travesty but regrettably nei-

ther was made in order by the Rules Committee.

Jackson Lee Amendment #1 would have improved this bad bill by amending the bill's 40 hour work week definition to include the employee's average commuting time in the computation of hours worked for purposes of determining "full-time employment."

Commuting time has become a major issue for those who work hourly wage jobs because their workday is much longer.

According to the Bureau of the Census nearly 8.1% of American workers commute 60 minutes or longer.

In 2011, almost 600,000 full-time workers had "mega-commutes" of at least 90 minutes and travel 50 miles or more from their homes. The daily average one-way travel to work for employees nationally is 25.5 minutes, and 1 out of 4 workers cross county lines to reach their jobs.

Jackson Lee Amendment #2 would have amended the bill by delaying the effective date of the bill until the first month after there has been two consecutive quarters in which the national unemployment rate is below 5 percent, which would indicate the nation has reached a full employment economy.

Our nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that health insurance is a personal responsibility with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. The law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program because it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

This week all over the nation, over 4 millions of Americans took the first step toward taking control of their lives by purchasing their first personal or family health insurance policy.

Over the course of the sign-up process for the Affordable Care Act tens of thousands of visitors each day shopped the website and over 7.1 million people were added to private insurance roles as customers or have enrolled into Medicaid.

Despite problems with the initial rollout of the online health insurance registration process, people were patient and persistent about getting coverage for themselves and their families.

I have held many events in my District to inform and connect people with Navigators and Community Health Centers to support the message that it was time to get health insurance for yourself and your family.

Why with 60 legislative days remaining in the Second Session of the 113th Congress before the end of the 2014 fiscal year, we are still seeing attempts to end the Affordable Care Act is a mystery to the American public who are voting with their own healthcare dollars for Obamacare.

H.R. 2575 proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by redefining a full time employee for purposes of providing health insurance to only those workers who work a 40-hour workweek.

Mr. Speaker, few hourly workers in low-wage jobs work a 40-hour work week. These employees often rely on government assistance, which amounts to a hidden tax break to employers.

Low waged workers often rely upon public housing assistance, SNAP, WIC or Medicaid to make ends meet.

Health insurance should not be used as a status symbol, but a basic right for people who live in the world's most prosperous nation.

I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the nation's health care system, but it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is a small vocal minority within the majority part that is causing headaches and heartaches to doctors and their patients.

I ask that my colleagues to join me in protecting workers by voting down this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 530 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 530, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 194, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Amash	Black	Byrne
Amodei	Blackburn	Calvert
Bachmann	Boustany	Camp
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Campbell
Barletta	Bridenstine	Cantor
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Capito
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Carter
Benishek	Broun (GA)	Cassidy
Bentivolio	Buchanan	Chabot
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Chaffetz

Coble	Issa
Cole	Jenkins
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam
Conaway	Jolly
Cook	Jones
Cotton	Jordan
Cramer	Joyce
Crawford	Kelly (PA)
Crenshaw	King (IA)
Culberson	King (NY)
Daines	Kingston
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)
Denham	Kline
Dent	Labrador
DeSantis	LaMalfa
DesJarlais	Lamborn
Diaz-Balart	Lance
Duffy	Lankford
Duncan (SC)	Latham
Duncan (TN)	Latta
Ellmers	LoBiondo
Farenthold	Long
Fincher	Lucas
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer
Fleischmann	Lummis
Fleming	Marchant
Flores	Marino
Forbes	Masse
Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)
Fox	McCauley
Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Frelinghuysen	McHenry
Gardner	McKeon
Garrett	McKinley
Gerlach	McMorris
Gibbs	Rodgers
Gibson	Meadows
Gingrey (GA)	Meehan
Gohmert	Messer
Goodlatte	Mica
Gosar	Miller (FL)
Gowdy	Miller (MI)
Granger	Mullin
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Griffin (AR)	Neugebauer
Griffith (VA)	Noem
Grimm	Nugent
Guthrie	Nunes
Hall	Nunnelee
Hanna	Olson
Harper	Palazzo
Harris	Paulsen
Hartzler	Pearce
Hastings (WA)	Perry
Heck (NV)	Petri
Hensarling	Pittenger
Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Holding	Poe (TX)
Hudson	Pompeo
Huelskamp	Posey
Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Hultgren	Reed
Hunter	Reichert
Hurt	Renacci

NAYS—194

Barber	Cooper	Garamendi
Barrow (GA)	Costa	Garcia
Bass	Courtney	Grayson
Beatty	Crowley	Green, Al
Becerra	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bera (CA)	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Bonamici	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Braley (IA)	DeLauro	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Hinojosa
Bustos	Dingell	Holt
Butterfield	Doggett	Honda
Capps	Doyle	Horsford
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Hoyer
Carney	Edwards	Huffman
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Israel
Cartwright	Engel	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Enyart	Jeffries
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Ciulline	Farr	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Fattah	Keating
Clay	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Kennedy
Clyburn	Fudge	Kildee
Cohen	Gabbard	Kilmer
Connolly	Gallego	Kind

Kirkpatrick	Nadler
Kuster	Napolitano
Langevin	Neal
Larsen (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Larson (CT)	Nolan
Lee (CA)	O'Rourke
Levin	Owens
Lewis	Pallone
Lipinski	Pascarell
Loeb	Pastor (AZ)
Lofgren	Payne
Lowenthal	Pelosi
Lowey	Perlmutter
Lujan Grisham	Peters (CA)
(NM)	Peterson
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree (ME)
(NM)	Pocan
Maffei	Polis
Maloney,	Price (NC)
Carolyn	Quigley
Maloney, Sean	Rahall
Matheson	Rangel
Matsui	Richmond
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard
McCollum	Ruiz
McDermott	Ruppersberger
McGovern	Rush
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda
Meeks	T.
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta
Michaud	Sarbanes
Miller, George	Schakowsky
Moore	Schiff
Moran	Schneider
Murphy (FL)	Schrader

NOT VOTING—8

Capuano	Conyers	Miller, Gary
Clark (MA)	Lynch	Peters (MI)
Coffman	McAllister	

□ 1347

Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. CARNEY, OWENS, CROWLEY, and SCHRADER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. STIVERS and SESSIONS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 152 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—236

Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Amash	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Coble
Bachmann	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barber	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Barr	Burgess	Conaway
Barton	Byrne	Cook
Benishek	Calvert	Cotton
Bentivolio	Camp	Cramer
Bilirakis	Campbell	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Crenshaw
Black	Capito	Culberson
Blackburn	Carter	Daines
Boustany	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney

Denham	Kingston	Roe (TN)	Lowenthal	Owens	Serrano	Cassidy	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)	Lowey	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
DeSantis	Kline	Rogers (KY)	Lujan Grisham	Pascrell	Shea-Porter	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rogers (MI)	(NM)	Pastor (AZ)	Sherman	Chaffetz	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	Luján, Ben Ray	Payne	Sires	Chu	Kaptur	Richmond
Duffy	Lamborn	Rokita	(NM)	Pelosi	Slaughter	Ciциlline	Kelly (IL)	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rooney	Maffei	Peters (CA)	Speier	Clay	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen	Maloney,	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)	Cleaver	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)
Ellmers	Latham	Roskam	Carolyn	Pingree (ME)	Takano	Coble	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	Latta	Ross	Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Thompson (CA)	Cole	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Fincher	Lipinski	Rothfus	Matheson	Polis	Thompson (MS)	Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Royce	Matsui	Price (NC)	Tierney	Cook	Kingston	Rokita
Fleischmann	Long	Runyan	McCarthy (NY)	Quigley	Titus	Cooper	Kline	Rooney
Fleming	Lucas	Ryan (WI)	McCollum	Rangel	Tonko	Courtney	Kuster	Roskam
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Salmon	McDermott	Richmond	Tsongas	Cramer	Labrador	Ross
Forbes	Lummis	Sanford	McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen	Crawford	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Fox	Marchant	Scalise	McNerney	Ruiz	Vargas	Crenshaw	Lamborn	Roybal-Allard
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Schock	Meeks	Ruppersberger	Veasey	Cuellar	Langevin	Royce
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Schrader	Meng	Rush	Vela	Culberson	Lankford	Ruiz
Gardner	McAllister	Schweikert	Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Daines	Larsen (WA)	Runyan
Garrett	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin	Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky	Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Gerlach	McCaul	Sensenbrenner	Moore	T.	Walz	DeGette	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Gibbs	McClintock	Sessions	Moran	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman	Delaney	Latta	Sanchez, Loretta
Gibson	McHenry	Shimkus	Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Schultz	DeLauro	Lipinski	Sanford
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Shuster	Nadler	Schakowsky	Waters	DelBene	Loeb sack	Scalise
Gohmert	McKeon	Simpson	Napolitano	Schiff	Waxman	Denham	Lofgren	Schneider
Goodlatte	McKinley	Sinema	Neal	Schneider	Welch	DesJarlais	Long	Schrader
Gosar	McMorris	Smith (MO)	Negrete McLeod	Schwartz	Wilson (FL)	Deutch	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Gowdy	Rodgers	Smith (NE)	Nolan	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth	Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Schweikert
Granger	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	O'Rourke	Scott, David		Dingell	Luetkemeyer	Scott (VA)
Graves (GA)	Meahan	Smith (TX)				Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Messer	Smith (WA)				Doyle	(NM)	Scott, David
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Southerland	Capuano	Fortenberry	Perlmutter	Duncan (SC)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sensenbrenner
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Stewart	Clark (MA)	Lynch	Peters (MI)	Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Serrano
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Stockman	Conyers	Miller, Gary	Stivers	Ellison	Marino	Sessions
Guthrie	Mullin	Stutzman				Engel	Massie	Sherman
Hall	Mulvaney	Terry				Enyart	Matsui	Shimkus
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)				Eshoo	McAllister	Shuster
Harper	Neugebauer	Thornberry				Esty	McCarthy (CA)	Simpson
Harris	Noem	Tiberi				Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Sinema
Hartzler	Nugent	Tipton				Fattah	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Turner				Fincher	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Heck (NV)	Nunnelee	Upton				Fleischmann	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Hensarling	Olson	Valadao				Fortenberry	McHenry	Smith (WA)
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Wagner				Foster	McIntyre	Southerland
Holding	Paulsen	Walberg				Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Speier
Hudson	Pearce	Walden				Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Stewart
Huelskamp	Perry	Walorski				Gabbard	McMorris	Swalwell (CA)
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Weber (TX)				Gallego	Rodgers	Takano
Hultgren	Pittenger	Webster (FL)				Garrett	McNerney	Thornberry
Hunter	Pitts	Wenstrup				Gibbs	Meadows	Tierney
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland				Gingrey (GA)	Meng	Titus
Issa	Pompeo	Whitfield				Goodlatte	Messer	Tonko
Jenkins	Posey	Williams				Gosar	Mica	Tsongas
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Wilson (SC)				Granger	Michaud	Van Hollen
Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Wittman				Grayson	Miller (MI)	Vela
Jolly	Reed	Wolf				Green, Al	Moran	Wagner
Jones	Reichert	Womack				Griffith (VA)	Mullin	Walder
Jordan	Renacci	Woodall				Grimm	Nadler	Walorski
Joyce	Ribble	Yoder				Guthrie	Napolitano	Walz
Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Yoho				Hahn	Neugebauer	Wasserman
King (IA)	Rigell	Young (AK)				Hanabusa	Noem	Schultz
King (NY)	Roby	Young (IN)				Harper	Nugent	Waters

NAYS—186

Barrow (GA)	Cuellar	Hahn
Bass	Cummings	Hanabusa
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Bera (CA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Himes
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Holt
Bonamici	DelBene	Honda
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Horsford
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	Doyle	Israel
Bustos	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Edwards	Jeffries
Capps	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Enyart	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Keating
Cartwright	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Kildee
Chu	Foster	Kilmer
Ciциlline	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Gabbard	Kuster
Cleaver	Gallego	Langevin
Clyburn	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Garcia	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Grayson	Lee (CA)
Cooper	Green, Al	Levin
Costa	Green, Gene	Lewis
Courtney	Grijalva	Loeb sack
Crowley	Gutiérrez	Lofgren

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1355

Mr. HUFFMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. SINEMA and Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 153, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 2014, I was traveling with President Obama for his address at the University of Michigan and unable to vote on the rule for H.R. 2575. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 157, answered “present” 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]
YEAS—262

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Butterfield
Amodei	Black	Byrne
Blackburn	Calvert	Camp
Blumenauer	Bonamici	Campbell
Barber	Boustany	Cantor
Barletta	Bridenstine	Capito
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Capps
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Cárdenas
Barton	Brown (FL)	Carney
Becerra	Buchanan	Carter
Bilirakis	Bustos	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)		

NAYS—157

Amash	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Bass	Conaway	Fox
Beatty	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Benishek	Costa	Fudge
Bentivolio	Cotton	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Crowley	Gardner
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Gerlach
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Gibson
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Graves (GA)
Broun (GA)	Dent	Graves (MO)
Brownley (CA)	DeSantis	Green, Gene
Bucshon	Duckworth	Griffin (AR)
Burgess	Duffy	Gutiérrez
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Hall
Castor (FL)	Ellmers	Hanna
Clarke (NY)	Farenthold	Hartzler
Clyburn	Fitzpatrick	Heck (NV)
Coffman	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Cohen	Flores	Holding

Holt	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda
Honda	Meehan	T.
Hoyer	Meeks	Sarbanes
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Schakowsky
Huelskamp	Miller, George	Schiff
Huizenga (MI)	Moore	Schock
Israel	Mulvaney	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Jeffries	Murphy (PA)	Sires
Jenkins	Neal	Slaughter
Johnson (OH)	Negrete McLeod	Smith (MO)
Jones	Nolan	Stivers
Jordan	Palazzo	Stockman
Joyce	Pallone	Stutzman
Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Terry
Kilmer	Paulsen	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Thompson (PA)
Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Tiberi
Lance	Peterson	Tipton
Lee (CA)	Pittenger	Turner
Levin	Pitts	Upton
Lewis	Poe (TX)	Valadao
LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Vargas
Lowey	Rahall	Veasey
Lummis	Reed	Velázquez
Maffei	Reichert	Visclosky
Maloney	Renacci	Walberg
Maloney, Carolyn	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Marchant	Rush	Woodall
Matheson	Ryan (OH)	Yoder
McDermott	Salmon	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Capuano	Grijalva	Peters (MI)
Clark (MA)	Lynch	Webster (FL)
Conyers	Miller, Gary	
Garamendi	Perlmutter	

□ 1402

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 154, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3717

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT
OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the bill (H.R. 2575) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2575

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Save American Workers Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF 30-HOUR THRESHOLD FOR CLASSIFICATION AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE FOR PURPOSES OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE IN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND REPLACEMENT WITH 40 HOURS.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (E), and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS TREATED AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph, an employer shall, in addition to the number of full-time employees for any month otherwise determined, include for such month a number of full-time employees determined by dividing the aggregate number of hours of service of employees who are not full-time employees for the month by 174."

(b) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (A), and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'full-time employee' means, with respect to any month, an employee who is employed on average at least 40 hours of service per week."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2575.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of restoring Americans' work hours so they can see bigger paychecks and more opportunities.

ObamaCare places an unprecedented government regulation on workers, changing the definition of "full-time work" from 40 hours per week to 30 hours. As a direct result, Americans across the country are having their hours cut at work, and they are seeing smaller paychecks. At a time when the costs of groceries, gas, and health care keep increasing, lower paychecks are simply unacceptable.

The bill we have before us today, the Save American Workers Act, would re-

peal ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek definition of "full-time employment" and would restore the traditional definition of a 40-hour workweek. Today, we are voting to restore hours and wages and to give businesses and their workers some relief from the burdens of ObamaCare. This is a critical step in creating an America that works.

I hear about the effects of ObamaCare from workers and employers across mid-Michigan. Recently, Central Michigan University was forced to cut back student employees' hours. As one student said:

Students use that money to pay for finances and school, and I think it's going to become increasingly harder for them to pay for school when we can only work 25 hours.

A faculty member at a community college in my district wrote to me recently, and said:

I hold two part-time positions . . . Today, I was informed I cannot continue to do both jobs because of ObamaCare laws. Beginning in August, I will no longer be advising and will lose approximately one-third of my income. Last year, I bought a house, a house I now fear I will no longer be able to afford.

By forcing employers to shift workers from full time to part time, the 30-hour rule is destroying hardworking Americans' abilities to earn more during these tough economic times. At a time when the President is calling on Congress to increase wages, it is his health care law that is forcing Americans to see smaller paychecks. ObamaCare is putting full-time work and the potential to earn more wages out of the reach of millions of Americans. Those who are hit the hardest are low-income Americans who are already struggling in these tough economic times. According to a Hoover Institution study, 2.6 million Americans making under \$30,000 a year are most at risk of having their hours and wages cut as a result of the 30-hour rule. Of that, over 60 percent are women, and 90 percent do not have a college degree.

The administration has made exceptions and has implemented delays for big businesses and political allies. Why not American workers and job creators?

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed the bill we are considering today will reduce ObamaCare's unacceptable burden on job creators and will increase wages for American workers. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Save American Workers Act will increase cash wages for American workers by \$75 billion, repeal \$63.4 billion in ObamaCare tax increases, and reduce the number of employers subject to penalties related to ObamaCare.

I applaud Congressman TODD YOUNG, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, for his work on this legislation.

It is time to vote in support of Americans who are facing higher bills and smaller paychecks. I urge my colleagues to join me in a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) to control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Senate continues to push for a 25 percent increase in the Federal minimum wage, they continue to ignore that millions of hourly workers face as much as a 25 percent pay cut as a result of ObamaCare. Because of the 30 hours is full time provision buried in the employer mandate, many employees face the prospect of being limited in their work hours. When they are not allowed to work more than 29 hours, they simply aren't able to generate the income they need to support themselves and their families.

It is worth noting that an employee who sees his hours cut from 39 to 29 is losing 10 hours a week, which, over the course of a month, is an entire week's worth of wages. The employees we are talking about are the people who most depend on getting every hour and every bit of wages that they can. We are talking about custodians, cafeteria workers, and substitute teachers at your child's school. We are talking about the waitresses and busboys at your favorite restaurant, about the cashier who rings you out at the grocery store, and about the guys on the assembly line who help make your car. In my district, we are also talking about adjunct professors at places like Ivy Tech Community College and Indiana University.

These are all Americans who want to work, but they are dealing with the unintended consequences—and I do believe they are unintended—of this health care law, ObamaCare. Some of these provisions are limiting their hours and pay, and this needs to be fixed. So I introduced the Save American Workers Act because I want to help these hardworking Hoosiers and other Americans who are just trying to make ends meet. By simply repealing this provision and restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek, we can help make an America that works.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. I commend my colleagues on the other side who have already signed on as cosponsors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues on the Republican side in the House are so blinded by their ideology that they will not or cannot see reality or hear other voices. So here is the reality:

7-plus million people have enrolled in private plans through the ACA marketplaces. The ACA is working; millions have new coverage under Medicaid; up to 129 million Americans with pre-existing health conditions, including 17 million children, no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or

about being charged higher premiums due to their health status; 3.1 million young adults have gained health coverage because they can now, up to age 26, stay on their parents' health plans. That is the reality of ACA.

There is more. There is also the reality of what this legislation would do, and I want to emphasize this because I don't think it has been accurately stated to date.

It would force 1 million people out of employer-based health insurance. According to the CBO, 1 million people would be forced out of employer-based health insurance. It would increase the number of uninsured by about a half a million people, also according to the CBO. So they are bringing this up at the same time that 7 million people have enrolled in private plans through the marketplace and when millions now have coverage under Medicaid. They essentially want to go in reverse in terms of health coverage, and they don't face up to this.

I think it has also been misdescribed. This bill would add \$74 billion to the deficit, according to the CBO, when there is no offset.

□ 1415

That is \$74 billion, and you are coming forth here, the day after we receive the latest information about ACA and all that has happened beneficially and now coming and saying knock people off of employer-based insurance and add \$74 billion to the deficit.

If any of those figures are wrong, I would like someone to stand up and say so.

Also, there has been much discussion about the impact in terms of part-time employment. I want to read what the CBO said definitively in February. In CBO's judgment:

There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA.

So as we heard in testimony, a community college came forth and said they had reduced the hours of teachers in order to avoid paying health insurance. Somebody in the education came forth and said that is their policy.

I suggest, instead of foregoing their responsibility as employers, they ought to go into the marketplace and see what they can do to bring more coverage for the people who are working hard.

Essentially, what you are doing here today is saying to many, many people who are working hard and who need insurance that this bill will knock you off your employer-based insurance and increase the number of uninsured by half a million, while increasing the deficit by \$74 billion. Ideology is indeed blind when this kind of a proposition is put forth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting this bill would decrease by \$63 billion the

amount of taxes on our employers during the worst economy, some will say, since the Great Depression. It will cause our wage earners around the country to realize an additional \$75 billion in wage income.

I take the fiscal condition of this country very seriously. I find it very hard to believe, though, that anyone—a Member of this body—would desire to pass a national health care law that is paid for on the backs of our hourly workers, those who can least afford to absorb lower wages, fewer hours, and perhaps losing their job altogether.

I think that is essentially the argument I hear from the other side when I hear the \$75 billion figure put forward.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there is no issue today that is more important in this body than growing the economy and creating jobs.

The Wall Street Journal noted that there are fewer jobs today than since the recession began back in 2007.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned we need to go in the marketplace. I have been in the marketplace for 30 years, as someone who created a lot of jobs, and I can tell you this health care mandate that has employees looking at 30 hours or less a week unless they get health care is a big issue. The 30-hour requirement is forcing businesses to reduce working hours and cut wages.

I had a gentleman in my congressional district last week that has three restaurants and 291 employees. He has mentioned to me numerous times that he is going to have to cut quite a few employees from 40 hours to 29 hours.

He has even suggested that, in many cases, to reduce his health care costs, he is going to have to push some people down even more hours, so he can bring down his health care costs.

The fact is that health care costs in my district are as much as \$1,500 to \$2,000 an employee, so it is a big issue.

Another employer in our area—one of our larger employers—is going to be moving hundreds of employees from 40 hours to 29 hours a week, so it is a very big issue in my congressional district in Sarasota.

With that, I would ask my colleagues for quick passage. We need to move this bill quickly.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The evidence is clear that more people would have their hours reduced if this bill passed than might be true under the present ACA.

I said what the CBO has said in terms of reduced hours of work. Once again, you are just not facing the reality. Changing this to 40 hours will hurt all around.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Ranking Member LEVIN, for yielding.

We speak a lot in this body about the freedoms that we as Americans have been endowed with by our forefathers and that are enshrined in the Constitution, whether it is the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, or our Second Amendment freedoms.

I think we all understand and know—unfortunately, too many Americans know firsthand—that when you are sick and lying in a hospital bed or at home and have a child that you can't afford to take to the doctor, those freedoms mean very little.

For someone who couldn't get health insurance, whose life is spiraling downward, who can't afford to make their car or mortgage payment, how much are those freedoms worth when their life is spiraling downward because they can't afford health care anymore?

The fact is one of the greatest things that the Affordable Care Act has done is allowed more Americans to be able to enjoy the freedoms that all of us here in Congress fight so hard to protect for the American people.

A few of the troubling things about this bill is that up to a million people would lose their health care coverage if this piece of legislation was enacted. As Congressman LEVIN mentioned, it would cost \$74 billion to the American people, adding to our debt and deficit.

What is also interesting is that just about every bill that is now allowed to pass through the House of Representatives requires a pay-for. In other words, the Republican majority does not allow a piece of legislation to be passed unless it is paid for by cutting something else.

What is different about this piece of legislation is that there is no question that it would cost \$74 billion, and yet there is absolutely no pay-for in this bill.

I would also note, as was mentioned, that this would cost American business some money. Well, a few things; first, many, many American businesses don't define the workweek as 40 hours. They define it as 32 hours or, sometimes, lower. Sometimes, it is 30.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. So this is inconsistent even with how millions of American businesses define full-time employment, and I would also point out this: we know that, as our economy has started to rebound from the worst recession that we have had since the Great Depression, many American businesses are doing well.

Wall Street is hitting all-time highs, and the stock market has soared. That is a good thing for America. We certainly don't begrudge any company or business that, but small businesses are already exempted from the ACA requirements, so this is about more sizable companies.

In an economy where business is doing well, why should we say to all of

these workers—people who are going to work every day, who have incredible work ethic, who are powering our economy—that they don't deserve health insurance?

I was in San Antonio—and I know it happened in many cities—and we had long lines on Monday to enroll in the Affordable Care Act. People's faces lit up because, for the first time in many of their lives, they were going to be able to afford health care coverage. Many of them had their kids with them. There were teenagers and senior citizens there.

This is a milestone in people's lives, and this bill would take that away from a million people.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know my good colleague spoke with a great deal of sincerity and earnestness when he talked about pay-fors.

It is worth noting, once again, that the attempt to pay for this Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare, as it is popularly known—on the backs of our hourly workers strikes me as unconscionable and something that none of us ought to be contemplating, which is why this is a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. Speaker, working on an hourly wage is tough. I know this. I worked every single job in a deli I started 25 years ago. Working an hourly wage is an opportunity to start, to work hard, to impress, and to be able to move up; but in today's world, it is a little different.

Today, because of ObamaCare, you don't have the opportunity to work the extra hours. You don't have the opportunity to expand.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to another colleague on this floor who said small businesses up to 50 employees were exempt, so now, our law is saying: you have to stay small, you can't grow, you can't have that American Dream to be something bigger.

Mr. Speaker, this affects business, but it also affects the public sector as well. In every single district across this country, this is having a great deal of effect.

In my own hometown in Kern County, the board of supervisors no longer allows seasonal workers, such as seasonal firefighters, because they can't go beyond the time allowed.

My community college in my district no longer has that extra job for the students. The students packed the boardroom and wanted to know why we could no longer do this. They pointed to one bill, ObamaCare.

Those are the stories you hear, the stories you know about, but numbers don't lie.

So what have the numbers shown since this law has gone into effect?

Last December, the Department of Labor showed low wage workers clocked the shortest workweek on record, only 27.4 hours a week. That is lower than during the recession.

Today, we have an opportunity to change that. Today, we have an opportunity to unshackle this, so an individual can work more hours. An individual that maybe owns a business can give other people opportunities; and, yes, the barrier will not be there to make sure you are only small, but you can have the American Dream. You can grow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all to join us and make it a bipartisan bill, when individuals have cosponsored this bill, to move America forward.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is too bad that we don't have a position called fact-checker on the floor. We could yield to the fact-checker every time something is misstated. If there were such a position here today, that person would be immensely busy.

For example, I think it is correct that student workers are exempted from the count, so to come here and talk about students, I think, misstates the facts.

The same is true of the story about the ACA would hurt workers, when the truth of the matter is this shift from 30 to 40 would indeed have a major impact in terms of people.

□ 1430

Let me read to you from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, dated October 12, 2013:

Moreover, raising the law's threshold for full-time work from 30 hours a week to 40 hours would make a shift toward part-time employment much more likely, not less so. That's because only a small share of workers today, less than 8 percent, work 34 hours a week and, thus, are more at risk of having their hours cut below health reform's threshold.

In comparison, 43 percent of employees work 40 hours a week, and another several percent 41 to 44 hours a week. Thus, raising the threshold to 40 hours would place more than five times as many workers at risk of having their hours reduced.

That is the reality. And to come here and to say that what would happen if we don't pass this bill is that more people would have their hours reduced than if we pass the bill, that simply is not correct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the House majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership in bringing this bill forward, the Save American Workers Act. It is today that I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. Speaker, every working American deserves a fair shot at climbing the economic ladder of success, and every wage earner deserves a chance to

live the American Dream. However, over the past few months, we have watched the President's health care law wreak havoc on working families and squeeze the middle class, who are already struggling to make ends meet.

As we all know, millions of people have seen their premiums and deductibles go up under the President's health care law, while others have been forced off the very plans they were promised they could keep. But that is not the full picture. Because of the 30-hour workweek provision in ObamaCare, wage earners could see their hours reduced, resulting in a 25 percent cut to their pay.

Now, let me just take a moment to explain exactly who might see their paychecks shrink. According to a study by the Hoover Institution, there are 2.6 million Americans especially at risk of having their wages cut. Of those 2.6 million, 59 percent are younger workers between the ages of 18 and 34, many of whom may be trying to save for college or for their first home; 63 percent are women, many of them single moms trying to support their children. The median household income for families most at risk from harm under this ObamaCare regulation is just over \$29,000. That is the median household income most at risk.

The bottom line is this: the workers most affected by these cuts are those who earn the least. For someone who currently earns \$10 an hour and works 40 hours a week, being cut to 29 hours means a loss of \$110 each and every week. Three out of four Americans are already claiming they are working paycheck to paycheck. A 25 percent cut to their income would have a devastating effect. This is not how America should work.

While this rule will impact Americans in all different industries, those who are most likely to be affected work in retail, restaurants, manufacturing, and even America's education sector.

In my hometown of Richmond, many school districts have begun to limit part-time workers to less than 30 hours a week to avoid added costs imposed by the advent of this health care law and would thus strain their budgets.

A substitute teacher named Amy, from Chesterfield County, Virginia, was asked by the Richmond Times-Dispatch about the burdens of this rule under ObamaCare, and she said: "The people that it is going to affect are the people that need or want to work every single day."

So why is the government punishing those who are looking to earn an honest wage?

This administration believes that they can hide the reality of the wage cuts with an increase in the minimum wage. But that proposal, which the nonpartisan experts say will result in 500,000 lost jobs, is not the answer. The answer is restore the 40-hour workweek and let people work.

We have known for a long time that the President's health care law was

broken, but now it is beginning to break the backs of American workers. Our constituents don't deserve this broken law or more broken promises. They deserve a fair shot at success without the government standing in the way.

Today, we have an opportunity to unclench this middle class squeeze and restore the 40-hour workweek so that wage earners don't have to worry about smaller paychecks. So let's stand together, in a bipartisan fashion, and take a big step towards creating an America that works again—and works again for everyone.

I would like to thank Chairman CAMP, Representative YOUNG, and the rest of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support working families by passing this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

I knew the majority would come here and talk about the middle class. They are trying to escape from their failure to help take action to provide jobs for middle class Americans.

They also, by the way, so far haven't helped out to provide the continuation of the unemployment insurance for hundreds of thousands of people, so many in the middle class, who have lost their jobs.

Look, I quoted from CBO, and I guess I will have to quote again. This is in February. "In CBO's judgment, there is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA."

I will quote again from this study of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and it is headed this way: "Health reform not causing significant shift to part-time work, but raising threshold to 40 hours a week would make a sizable shift likely."

I quoted why they say that because the number of people who are working 40 hours or thereabouts, that number is so much larger than those who are working 30 hours or thereabouts; and so any employer who wanted, essentially, to shift the burden from them to others, they are more likely to do it under this bill than under the present circumstance. That is the reason why it has been said by CBO that it would force 1 million people out of employer-based health insurance, and it would add \$74 billion to the deficit since it is not offset.

You haven't refuted a single one of those statements. If they are not true, I would like you to say so. I would like you to say CBO is wrong, and also wrong when they say it would increase the number of uninsured by half a million people.

Those are three CBO statements. They stand here to refute the myths that are being brought here in defense of this bill.

So you raise the middle class banner. At the same time, you essentially, with this bill, would take away health insur-

ance from many, many, many, many, many middle class citizens. That is what you would be doing here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before, the more we learn about the President's health care law, the more the facts show it is hurting more people than it is helping. The latest development now is the law's 30-hour rule is forcing some companies to scale back hours with more part-time jobs and less full-time jobs, so that those employees that have good full-time jobs are now having to go to part-time jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I met with a small business owner. He owns seven different restaurants. And I know that a lot of folks think that people in the restaurant industry, they only employ part-time workers, but 41 percent of his workers he employs full-time. But because of the new law, where now 30 hours is the standard being considered full-time work, he is being forced to lower the work hours for those employees, nearly all of them, to 29 hours or less. That absolutely makes no sense. These reduced hours are now going to force a 25 percent reduction in pay for those workers. Many will now have to go out and find a second part-time job just to make up for the hours that they lost.

Another small business owner I talked to from Minnesota, he was imploring me when he contacted me: please, Congress needs to correct the 30-hour rule so that it reflects his workforce's needs and his employees' desire to have more flexible hours. He said, if it's not addressed by Congress soon, there will be disruptions in the workforce, and the flexible work options for his employees could disappear altogether.

The 30-hour work rule is negatively impacting restaurateurs, manufacturers, and even our schools, as was mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker. We should be removing these barriers to work. We should not punish employees who want to work more, and we should be helping American workers.

So let's pass this legislation. It will restore some common sense and a common understanding in America that full-time work is 40 hours. It will pass with bipartisan support.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue for getting Americans back to work.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to also indicate the fact that I, too, have read the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of this legislation. They indicate that \$75 billion in wages will be lost as a result of the Affordable Care Act if something like the Save American Workers Act isn't implemented.

So, effectively, I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle making the case that we ought to be funding the Affordable Care Act essentially on the backs of these hourly workers, and I don't think that is a position anyone wants to find themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, as we throw all these numbers around, I guess they mean a lot on the floor debate, but to the real people that are suffering, they don't really mean anything.

There is an old adage that says there are lies, damn lies, and statistics. We are throwing numbers around here like they matter, but the fact is there are real people's lives that are being hurt, being destroyed.

In fact, I read an article just a few months ago that the community college where I met my wife is actually notifying 1,300 employees, 700 of them that were adjunct professors, that their hours are going to be reduced, and they are being reduced because of this law. They are being hurt.

I guess we can quote them a statistic to tell them: go on your merry way. I know you can't pay for your mortgage. I know you can't make your car payment. You can't pay for your child's college education, but we got this great statistic that we just got out of Congress that ought to make you feel better about your life.

The fact is we ought to be more concerned about individuals than we are throwing numbers around.

I understand CBO also said that total implementation of ObamaCare would cost \$2.1 trillion. The fact is we can use statistics to say just about whatever we want them to say, but real people's lives are being hurt; and we have a responsibility here in this body to do everything that we can to try to raise the lifestyle in this country, not degrade it.

People are losing their jobs. My son lost his insurance because of ObamaCare. He was one of that small percentage—again, a statistic—that we were quoted, but the fact is he lost his insurance. Now he just told us that he is having his third child. The first two children were delivered by a doctor that they know and trust, but because of ObamaCare, their doctor is not covered under their new policy. To add insult to injury, when he went on the exchange to sign up, after he was told that his policy was no longer covered because of ObamaCare, his premiums went up from \$450 a month to \$850 a month. That is hardly helping people.

I think that it is safe to note, this law was passed without one Republican, and it is time that we stopped our high horse of statistics and actually care about people.

□ 1445

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if you care about people you should be for the ACA. Seven million people have been enrolled in private plans through the ACA marketplaces, 7 million-plus. And millions—we will get the figures—now have coverage under Medicaid. That is lots of millions of people, and you come forth with an individual case?

In many cases, I don't know your instance, these cases have turned out to be incorrect. They have been put in political ads, and they have been refuted.

I now want to read the Statement of Administration Policy from the President:

The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act—it should be the so-called Save American Workers Act—because it would significantly increase the deficit and reduce the number of Americans with employer-based health insurance. Rather than attempting once again to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which the House has tried to do over 50 times, it is time for the Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity and security for middle class families and all those working to get into the middle class.

This legislation would weaken the provision of the Affordable Care Act that keeps employers from dropping health insurance coverage and shifting the cost to taxpayers. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it would increase the budget deficit by \$73.7 billion over the 2015 to 2024 period. Moreover, the proposed change would reduce the number of people receiving employer-based coverage by about 1 million, while increasing the number of uninsured.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care. Since October 1, over 7 million have signed up for insurance in the health insurance marketplaces. Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a preexisting condition now have access to coverage. Additionally, the law helps millions of Americans stay on their parents' plan until age 26 and provides access to free preventive care like cancer screenings that catch illness early on.

While the administration welcomes ideas to improve the law, H.R. 2575 would undermine it by shifting costs to taxpayers and causing employers either to drop or to not expand health insurance coverage.

"If the President"—and this is underlined—"were presented with H.R. 2575 he would veto it."

With that very effective, I think so convincing statement—I hope all listen to it—I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I just heard. I heard that individual cases ought not be cited, that that is somehow off limits.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues just cited the example of his son, lost his insurance despite the promises of

this bill during campaign season. He lost his doctor. He saw his insurance premiums and copays go up. These are real lives we are talking about. These are real hours and real wages that we are trying to remedy. This is a real 40-hour workweek that people depend upon.

Then to cite the Statement of Administration Policy as somehow being more authoritative than these personal examples I find, frankly, a bit off-putting.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It was pointed out by the chairman in the House Education and the Workforce Committee, as the name suggests, the committee has broad jurisdiction over policies affecting our Nation's classrooms and workplaces. It goes without saying that both face difficult challenges today.

Budget constraints continue to plague States, school districts, and institutions of higher education, straining their ability to effectively serve students. Workers and job creators are still struggling in a persistently anemic economy, making it difficult for many Americans to pay the bills and provide for their families.

Unfortunately, the health care law is making things worse. Thanks to the President's government-run scheme, full-time jobs are being destroyed, not created. Health care costs are going up, not down; and millions of individuals are losing the health care plan they like—an example of which we just heard earlier—instead of keeping it as promised.

This reality isn't limited to private businesses. It is a reality unfolding in schools, colleges, and universities across the country. Recent headlines confirm in stark detail how the President's health care law is hurting our education system.

From The Washington Free Beacon: "Alabama schools face shortage of substitute teachers due to ObamaCare."

From The Weekly Standard: "Hours cut for 200 North Carolina teachers due to ObamaCare."

And just in case my friends from the other side of the aisle would accuse me of selecting only conservative publications, from The New York Times: "Public sector capping part-time hours to skirt health care law."

Aside from press reports, we have also heard firsthand accounts of how ObamaCare is making it harder for school leaders to meet the needs of students. In December, the committee asked the public to share personal stories about the effects of the health care law on local classrooms and campuses.

Helieanna, from Saint Anthony, Minnesota, described her dream to teach at the school she once attended as a student. While that dream may have come

true, she wrote that her financial situation is less stable than it was before the health care law.

Kate, from Hemet, California, informed the committee that her community college would have to restrict workers' hours, noting this impacts our ability to properly serve students.

Secretary Sebelius once dismissed concerns about jobs lost and hours cut under ObamaCare as "speculation." Yet for Helieanna, Kate, and countless others, the health care law is wreaking havoc on their families, their livelihood, and their schools. It is time to do something about it.

By restoring the traditional standard of full-time work, the Save American Workers Act will help restore workers' hours and allow them to earn the wages they deserve. Just as important, the legislation will provide relief for schools grappling with a flawed health care law.

Congress should not stand by while teachers have their hours cut and students receive diminished access to educational opportunities, all because of bad policies out of Washington.

Certainly I urge my colleagues to provide relief for our Nation's workplaces and classrooms by supporting the Save American Workers Act. I would point out, as my colleague did, that taking the administration's Statement of Administrative Policy as definitive here defies, frankly, all logic.

There is no one in America who would be surprised that the President doesn't want changes to his law, unless he unilaterally makes those changes, because after all, Mr. Speaker, if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan—unless you can't. If you like your doctor, Mr. Speaker, you can keep your doctor—except when you can't.

Before I yield back my time, I would like to thank the Ways and Means Committee for their excellent work on this legislation, and I would like to take a moment to recognize my friend and colleague, DAVE CAMP, who announced earlier this week his plan to retire. During more than 20 years of service, Chairman CAMP has been a distinguished Member, a dedicated reformer, and tireless champion of working families. We are going to miss him. I wish him all the best.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of our time today be managed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this bill, the so-called Save American Workers Act, and to speak in support of work-

ing men and women of this great country. I am here today and every day, not only as a Member of Congress, but as someone who knows what it is like to work for a living.

As someone who for 18 years as an ironworker strapped on a pair of work boots during boom times and down economies, I know what it is like to stand in an unemployment line when my local shipyard closed and when our auto plant shut down.

Mr. Speaker, I am part of the American workforce. Like many of my colleagues, I represent hundreds of thousands of hard-working people who struggle every day to make ends meet. That is why I am deeply offended that the Republican leadership of this House, the people's House, has the temerity to refer to any of their efforts in the context of saving the American worker.

Now, the simple fact is that during my time in Congress the actions of my colleagues, especially the Republican leadership, have spoken loudly to the contrary. It is impossible in the time allowed to me to cover all the anti-worker efforts that the Republican majority has undertaken since I have been in Congress. They have continually tried to roll back prevailing wage laws and workers' rights and protections that have been in place since the 1930s. They tried to cripple the National Labor Relations Board, put in place in 1935 to protect American workers.

Their attacks on the Federal workforce are ceaseless, freezing pay and cutting benefits, and demoralizing our hard-working men and women in government. The Republican leadership has opposed equal pay for women; they have opposed raising the minimum wage; they have opposed employee non-discrimination legislation. In fact, they won't even bring some of those bills for a vote.

As we struggle to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, the Republican leadership has refused to extend emergency unemployment benefits to the long-term unemployed, many of whom use that money just to put food on the table while they search for work.

Now the Republican majority has the audacity to put forward a bill they call the Save American Workers Act. We have got to save the American worker from you. That is who we need to be saving them from.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the Speaker for his indulgence.

The bill before us today is more of the same. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bill will add \$74 billion to the Federal deficit, force 1 million more people to lose employer-covered health care, and leave 500,000 completely uninsured.

According to a study released by the University of California Berkley, this

bill will cause 6.5 million workers to lose more hours. This bill, like so many others offered by my colleagues from across the aisle, is not crafted to save the American worker. It is crafted to increase the profits of large employers while workers continue to struggle.

Perhaps this bill should be named the "Save American CEO Act." It is the height of hypocrisy, that after all their efforts to harm the American worker my colleagues should have the audacity to even offer a bill entitled "Save American Workers Act."

We all know and realize that we need to save the American worker from the Republican leadership. That is what we need to do. So I urge my colleagues to continue to oppose these efforts to destroy the middle class and sabotage the American worker and the American family.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this bill would repeal ObamaCare's mandate on employers to provide insurance to all employees working at least 30 hours per week and would instead restore the traditional 40-hour standard. Everywhere I go, I hear concerns about the lack of jobs and the need for job creation. Tennessee's unemployment rate is still near 7 percent. We need to be doing everything possible to encourage employers to not only create jobs, but to maintain current jobs.

That is why the 30-hour standard makes no sense. Employers are already struggling to make their budgets work in the stagnant Obama economy. We all know how the employers are forced to respond: by cutting hours or hiring fewer workers. There is concrete evidence this is already happening, not just in the private sector. In my own hometown, Johnson, Tennessee, where I was mayor before I came here, the city school system been forced to keep approximately 200 employees, including substitute teachers, below the 129 hours a month.

□ 1500

This hurts the families that count on that income and the schoolchildren that benefit from the efforts of these adults.

President Obama's case for defending this flawed law is built on a false premise: that there is no other way to help individuals who cannot afford health insurance or who have been affected by a catastrophic illness or disease.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent my entire adult life as a physician taking care of people from all walks of life. I want every American to have access to an affordable health care plan, and I have worked since I arrived in Congress to develop patient-centered solutions to help people afford health care, like H.R. 3121, the American Health Care Reform Act.

There are ways to reach this goal without creating massive new bureaucracies, spending \$2 trillion, weakening the doctor-patient relationship, or increasing premiums for millions of hardworking Americans, but the President won't even engage in a conversation. So, in the meantime, we must do everything we can to protect the American people from this law. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself, Mr. Speaker, such time as I may consume.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is about the 52nd time that the Republican majority has attempted to either repeal or derail the Affordable Care Act. I don't know why they do it so often since constitutionally it is abundantly clear that they don't have the votes to pass it in the Senate, and clearly, if it ever reached the President's desk, it would be vetoed, and there are not enough votes to override the veto. So, clearly, this madness continues even after more than enough people have enrolled, far beyond those that were expected by some of the Republicans. And this struggle, this madness, goes on as though Democrats are the only people that are going to become sick and need health care.

So I don't know where we go from here. I assume that comes the next election, once again, the voters will speak out. And for those people that have had kids on their insurance policy, we will hear from them; for those who have had preconditions and couldn't get health insurance, we will hear from them; for those that thought that getting preventive health care was a luxury, we should hear from them; but, more importantly, the people who just could not afford insurance. I cannot conceive how these people are all Democrats, in that the Republicans have no people that are vulnerable to illnesses and the severe expenses that are involved.

But, clearly, it has been my opinion that if this bill doesn't work, if it fails, and if some of these tactics had been successful, that the Democrats would be embarrassed by its failure. But I also thought—and it makes a lot of sense to me—that if, indeed, the American people started to understand the complexities of the bill and thought they were in need of health insurance, as close to 10 million people feel, then the Republicans would have to defend their negative position as to why they fight so hard to deny people health insurance.

So I understand from Mr. LYNCH that the bill is named after workers. So that brings me to include a letter for the RECORD from the AFL/CIO. Clearly, this is not a management outfit but really supports the workers, and they, of course, are opposed to this bill that is drafted to go nowhere.

In addition to that, I include for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the AFSCME into the RECORD, which represents county and municipal employ-

ees, and they strongly oppose the legislation that the Republican majority has brought to the floor.

Lastly, I include for the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association that opposes this legislation.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I would like to join in with the majority that has complimented the work of Chairman DAVID CAMP. His announcement surprised most of us, but I don't think in his challenge that he has really proven his chairmanship to be all that we expected from him and then some. I regret the Republicans have passed over his opportunity to reform the tax law, but, then again, the chairman's tax reform law made too much sense for anybody to think that it would be picked up by the Republican majority. But it was a bill that would be great for discussion; it was hard hitting; it provided a lot of savings; and it reduced the rates.

So I don't know why before he leaves that we couldn't have this taken up, but it is my understanding that the gift that was given to him by his majority was just to allow him to present his draft. I think that is unfortunate because, if ever there was a time we need to reform the tax laws, it would be now. So I congratulate Chairman CAMP for his attempt to introduce this to the House, and I regret that the Republican majority has, out of hand, rejected it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, January 28, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act (H.R. 2575) sponsored by Congressman Todd Young and the Forty Hours is Full Time Act (H.R. 2988) introduced by Representative Dan Lipinski.

Both of these bills would weaken the employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by increasing to 40 hours per week the threshold at which employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. Contrary to the intent of this legislation, economic data show that raising the threshold would cause more employers to reduce the hours of their workers, and it would result in millions of working families losing employment-based insurance coverage.

As the Ways and Means Committee examines these issues in a hearing this week, and as discussions continue, the House should instead seek to strengthen the employer responsibility requirements of the ACA by lowering the hours threshold, requiring employers to provide coverage for workers who work 20 hours a week or more, and by applying a pro rata shared responsibility penalty if workers with fewer than 20 hours are not offered coverage. This is the only way to protect groups of workers—such as low-wage employees, school staff, and adjunct professors—that will lose wages under the existing incentive to reduce hours.

Unfortunately, the ACA's employer responsibility requirements do not adequately sanction employers that drop coverage or decline to offer affordable, comprehensive coverage. The \$2,000 penalty for not offering coverage to a full-time employee pales in comparison to the average annual cost of single

coverage, which was \$5,884 in 2013. The ACA's extension of Medicaid eligibility to the uninsured will tempt low road employers to move lower-income employees into the program, since the law has no penalty to discourage employers from shifting the responsibility for covering these workers. In the construction industry, where the vast majority of firms have fewer than 50 employees, there is no penalty for companies that fail to provide coverage, creating a competitive disadvantage for employers that do provide coverage. A true "employer mandate" would address these issues and other weaknesses in the employer requirements.

The bills introduced by Representatives Young and Lipinski would take the ACA in the opposite direction, compounding the problem they seek to solve. A December 2013 analysis by the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education found that the approach employed by this legislation—moving the threshold for coverage from 30 hours to 40 hours—would result in reduced work hours for three times as many workers (6.5 million) compared to the number vulnerable to a reduction of hours at the current threshold (2.3 million).

The researchers also found that the approach would "effectively eliminate" the employer shared responsibility requirement, because employers could cut workers to 39 hours or less with relatively little cost. Pointing to the Congressional Budget Office estimate that one million workers will lose job-based coverage as a result of the Administration's one-year delay in implementing the current employer responsibility rules, the researchers warned that making the "employer requirement effectively non-binding on a permanent basis" would cause many more workers to lose employment-based coverage. The responsibility for covering this group would shift from employers to the federal government, incurring substantial new costs. Instead, the authors recommend that the incentive to reduce hours created by the 30-hour cliff could be addressed by applying the employer requirement to part-time workers and by pro rating the penalty for these workers.

The AFL-CIO endorses this kind of approach. We seek a full penalty for employers that fail to provide affordable, comprehensive coverage to workers averaging 20 hours a week or more. A pro-rated penalty should apply if adequate coverage is not provided to employees working less than 20 hours. This policy would eliminate the cliff imposed by the current 30-hour threshold, rather than simply shifting it higher and creating a new incentive for employers to reduce hours.

We look forward to working with you to strengthen the employer responsibility rules of the ACA, by extending coverage requirements to part-time workers and bolstering requirements related to the affordability and comprehensiveness of coverage. Achieving the coverage goals of the Affordable Care Act will depend upon maintaining employer responsibility for providing coverage to working families.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, February 3, 2014.
HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American, Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act

(H.R. 2575), sponsored by Rep. Todd Young and the Forty Hours is Full Time Act (H.R. 2988), sponsored by Rep. Dan Lipinski.

Both of these bills would weaken employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by increasing to 40 hours per week, the threshold at which employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. Based on research described in testimony to the Committee last week, three times as many workers would be at risk of a reduction in hours if one of these bills became law. Rather than resolve any problems that may exist, these bills would make them worse.

Financing our health care system must be a shared responsibility. While our health care system is based on employer-provided coverage, some employers are shirking their responsibility. Instead of making it easier for employers to do so, the ACA should be strengthened to ask more from employers. We urge the Committee to approve legislation that would require employers to provide coverage for those working 20 hours or more, or pay a penalty. A pro-rated penalty should apply for workers who put in fewer than 20 hours per week.

Today, we urge you to oppose legislation to raise the hour's threshold to 40.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. LOVELESS.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, February 4, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 3 million members of the National Education Association, and the students they serve, we urge you to vote NO on the Save American Workers Act of 2013 (H.R. 2575), scheduled to be voted on in committee today. We oppose the bill because we believe it would create a disincentive for employers to provide health care coverage, negatively impacting employer sponsored health insurance and harming families, children and educators who need coverage.

We believe that the Affordable Care Act's shared responsibility for employers, sometimes referred to as the employer penalty, supports the overall goal of expanding quality, affordable coverage to all Americans.

We are concerned that this bill's changes to the ACA's definition of what constitutes full-time employment from "on average at least 30 hours of service per week" monthly to an average of 40 hours per week monthly would adversely affect overall employer-sponsored health coverage. It also may lead to higher costs to the federal government as workers are passed off to exchanges and potentially become eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions.

Additionally, if employer-based coverage is reduced, an even greater number of low-income individuals and their families in the 25 states that have refused to expand Medicaid will be unable to afford buying health benefits. In those states, childless adults whose incomes fall below 100 percent of the federal poverty line will not only be denied access to Medicaid coverage, but they will be ineligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions through a health insurance marketplace (exchange). Moving the full-time definition from 30 hours to 40 hours, as this bill does, would only expand the number of people hurt by this coverage gap.

We believe the bill misses the mark by substituting "40 hours" for "30 hours" because it would do nothing to stop employers' misuse of the ACA's employer penalty provisions as a justification for cutting employees' hours. Experience with this portion of the ACA shows that one of the biggest implementation challenges in the education sector consists of making sure that employers and other health plan sponsors fully understand

the law's provisions related to shared responsibility for employers. For years, we have engaged with the Department of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service to ensure that regulations on shared responsibility for employers work consistently well in the education sector, and believe regulators have taken important steps to correct this.

The changes contemplated in H.R. 2575, however, would simply shift the hours-related context in which these common errors take place:

Mistakenly believing that the only way to avoid employer penalties is to cut employees' hours to under 30 a week or to under six hours a day;

Misunderstanding how and when to use proposed regulations related to an optional hours-counting method called the look-back measurement method;

Overestimating the potential cost of complying with the law's provisions on shared responsibility for employers; and

Failing to incorporate into decision-making the statutory and regulatory provisions that ensure that this part of the ACA establishes possible penalties on large employers rather than an "employer mandate."

These and other ACA-implementation errors can lead to exaggerated responses that hurt students, workers, and families alike. Unfortunately, H.R. 2575 would just shift the hours-related focal point for such errors.

Employers who take the time to understand the law and regulations as they currently stand can develop common sense, constructive, and consensual approaches to properly implementing the law.

Again, we urge you to vote NO on H.R. 2575. We would welcome the opportunity to work with the committee on this issue.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,

Director of Government Relations.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that to get a bill this far in the legislative process requires the work of a lot of people: my own staff within my office, the committee staff, and my fellow colleagues who are willing to provide a consultative role, constructive advice, and a very strong leadership role.

So, with that, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, TIM WALBERG, who helped us introduce this bill. He is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman. I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here in support of this legislation—good legislation—that will help people in my district in Michigan, a hard-hit State because of economic problems and, I think, bad, bad efforts and policies from an administration that didn't understand that workers who are encouraged to work to their fullest extent produce an economy.

It is hard to take seriously the objections of the Democrat side of the aisle here when they talk about the middle class, they talk about employees and their efforts to help them, a party who enshrines the minimum wage and unemployment insurance as the golden grail of what grows an economy. I find that absurd.

It is a party who has decimated the middle class in the last 6 years with

policies including what we are discussing today. Moving from 40 hours to 30 hours as full-time worker requirements? I don't get it.

We also understand it is the same party that told us, if you like your insurance, you can keep it—no. If you like your doctor, you can keep it—no. If you like your hospital, you can keep it—no. And now we hear their objection that basically says, if you like your job, you can keep it—no.

Back in September, before this ill-advised law took place, Janet from Jackson, Michigan, called my office in tears, a 56-year-old mother of three, single parent, who had just been told that morning by her job provider in home health care—a very valuable field of service—that she no longer would be working 36 hours, which was her normal working hour opportunity, and was being moved back to 28 because of what? The Affordable Care Act requirements. And so she said to my office staff, in tears:

How am I now going to make it when I was making it on 36 hours at that job, supplementing that with a waitress job on the weekend, and I was paying my mortgage and my insurance, and now I am going to be asked to pay for all that on 28 hours? I am 56 years old. Where am I going to get another job?

That is what is being produced by this. We want to give Janet the opportunity to have her 36 hours back. We want to give Jim, Jerry, and Joan, and all the rest of the people, the opportunity to have the fullest hours they can possibly have in an America that grows the middle class and gives opportunity for success.

Mr. RANGEL. I just don't know what part of the Constitution the gentleman doesn't understand, but the truth of the matter is that this law passed the House of Representatives, passed the Senate, was signed into law, and verified by the United States Supreme Court, and still we hear people yelling at the darkness that we should repeal it.

Now, there are ways to do these things, but one thing is abundantly clear: the way we have been going about this, the 52 parliamentary opportunities that the House has had, this doesn't work. And so if you tried something 51 times, it would seem to me, unless somebody is putting something in the water on the other side of the aisle, that we will try something else like try to repair it, try to fix it, try in a bipartisan way to see where we agree that changes could be made to make it easier for employers and employees. But this barking at the Moon, to me, is just a waste of taxpayers' money and time.

How many speakers do we have, and how much time do we have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from New York has 62 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 64 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. How many speakers does the gentleman have? I only have two speakers.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. We have six speakers on this side.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter of support for the Save American Workers Act, the bipartisan bill, by the National Restaurant Association.

Mr. Speaker, I also now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, April 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, the leading trade association representing the restaurant and foodservice industry, I write to urge you to vote YES in favor of H.R. 2575, the "Save American Workers Act," when it is considered on the House floor this week. The National Restaurant Association may consider any votes on, or related to, such legislation in our annual "How They Voted" legislative scorecard.

H.R. 2575 would reinstate the historic definition of full-time as working 40 hours per week. The law's definition of full-time set at 30 hours could have lasting impacts on the labor market, far beyond the Affordable Care Act, with the unintended consequence of potentially limiting hours for workers who do not intend to rely on their employer for their insurance needs.

One reason so many Americans are drawn to restaurant and foodservice industry jobs is the flexibility to build a work schedule or change hours to suit their personal needs. Generally, most restaurant operators have classified positions as salaried and hourly, not full- or part-time. Previously, hourly workers were able to take on extra shifts as available and as they chose to work. However, under this law, there is now a bright line as to who is considered full-time and who is considered part-time. As a result, the flexibility so many enjoy and seek out in working for the industry may become harder to find.

In its analysis of the legislation, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) acknowledged employers' commitment to offering coverage to employees and projects that only a small percentage of employers would either reassign or reduce hours of employees who work more than 40 hours per week. More than 156 million people would continue to be covered by employer-sponsored plans, underscoring the CBO's conclusion that "most of the affected employers would continue to offer coverage because most employers construct compensation packages to attract the best available workers at the lowest possible cost."

Aligning the law's definition of full-time employee status with current levels used by restaurant and foodservice operators would help avoid any unnecessary disruptions to employees' wages and hours, and would provide significant relief to employers. The National Restaurant Association supports H.R. 2575 and encourages you to vote YES when it is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

SCOTT DEFIFE,
Executive Vice President,
Policy and Government Affairs.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman YOUNG, for yielding.

As an original cosponsor, I am very grateful for Chairman JOHN KLINE and Congressman TODD YOUNG for their thoughtful leadership on this very important issue with the Save American Workers Act.

ObamaCare is the saddest example of Big Government failure. The American people have lost their health care plans, access to their most trusted doctors, and been forced to pay significant premium increases for poorer coverage and higher deductibles.

On top of all of these broken promises, it is tragic for American families that the President's signature health care law will also destroy jobs. Every day, real constituents living in South Carolina's Second Congressional District reach out to me expressing frustration with this broken law. Jennifer, a true small business owner from Lexington, writes:

Keep trying to repeal ObamaCare at all costs. The employer mandate will cause my business to move full-time employees to part-time.

Dozens of actual people express these same sentiments and plead with Congress to provide relief. The National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, was correct that ObamaCare will destroy 1.6 million jobs.

ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule is lowering wages for a significant portion of hardworking Americans, the very ones the President claims to champion.

On behalf of the millions of Americans who are receiving smaller paychecks and having to work multiple jobs, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and provide greater economic security and opportunity for those who need it the most.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee that played such an important role in bringing this historic legislation to the floor and to the law.

□ 1515

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic week for the economic security of the American people. After the unprecedented surge in enrollment, the Affordable Care Act has led to the largest expansion of health insurance coverage in half a century.

More than 7.1 million Americans have signed up for private coverage through the marketplaces. More than 3 million young adults are covered through their parents' plans, and millions more Americans are now covered through Medicaid or through private insurance purchased directly from an insurer.

According to an analysis by the Los Angeles Times, more than 9.5 million Americans who previously lacked health insurance now have coverage because of the Affordable Care Act.

These millions of Americans now have the peace of mind and economic security that comes with quality, af-

fordable health insurance, and every American knows that they will never be discriminated against because of a preexisting condition. These are historic achievements.

However, despite these reforms to our health system, the Affordable Care Act does not change the fact that the vast majority of Americans who have health insurance get it through their employer. In fact, the law strengthens the employer-sponsored insurance system.

It encourages larger employers to do the responsible thing and offer their employees affordable coverage. It ensures that workers get quality coverage and do not face harsh annual limits on their coverage.

The bill before us today, however, weakens the employer-sponsored insurance system and hurts American workers. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the bill would cause 1 million Americans to lose their employer coverage.

CBO found that the bill will cause half a million Americans to become uninsured, and CBO found that the bill will cost taxpayers nearly \$75 billion.

Republicans claim that all these costs are worthwhile because their legislation will keep workers from having their hours cut, but the fact is this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

CBO said it plainly:

There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, we have added more than 8.6 million private sector jobs. After years of increasing part-time labor, the number of part-time workers today is actually lower than it was before the ACA was enacted. The flimsy justification for this bill just does not stand up to scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the end of the ACA's first open enrollment period can be an opportunity for the Congress to change its approach to this law. More than 7 million Americans have signed up for coverage through health insurance marketplaces.

Tens of millions more will sign up in the months and years to come. Rather than pushing divisive legislation, let's come together to acknowledge the fact that millions of Americans getting covered is a great step forward for this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter of support from the International Franchise Association for this bill, and I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

INTERNATIONAL

FRANCHISE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, February 3, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Franchise Association, I write today to urge you to support H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, sponsored by Rep. Todd Young (R-IN). This legislation will change the definition of a full-time employee in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to 40

hours, the definition that employers have traditionally used to manage their workforce, and will help small businesses better adjust to the ACA's employer mandate.

For decades, employers have used the 40-hour work week as a standard for workforce management. The ACA's provision requiring employers to provide coverage to full-time employees, and defining full-time as 30-hours, will cause many employers to simply manage their part-time employees to fewer hours. Data from a recent Public Opinion Strategies survey commissioned by the IFA and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce shows that 31 percent of franchises and 12 percent of non-franchised businesses have already reduced worker hours to lower costs, a full year before the employer mandate is set to take effect. Not only has the employer mandate discouraged job creation and business expansion, it has also damaged existing jobs by including a misguided statutory requirement that discarded more than a half-century of established labor policy.

The employer mandate will hurt American workers in many ways, but one of the most devastating effects of the mandate is that fewer workers will be offered health insurance, and employees will be less able to afford their own coverage when working fewer hours. Allowing employers to manage their workers to the traditional 40-hour work week will give employees more flexibility and eliminate the need to revamp longstanding employer personnel policies.

IFA urges you to support the Save American Workers Act. This is a common-sense effort to a problem we know is only going to get worse. The passing of this bill would provide much-needed relief and flexibility for employers and employees by avoiding the worst effects of the employer mandate.

While this measure will not make the Affordable Care Act completely workable for the 825,000 franchise locations nationwide or the 9 million workers they employ, it will help both employers and workers better absorb the impact of the employer mandate.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. CALDEIRA,
President & Chief Executive Officer,
International Franchise Association.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation. Let's focus on schools in my district. Greencastle School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of 54 employees from full time to part time.

The Terre Haute School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of hundreds of employees. Many of them are bus drivers who are no longer allowed to provide transportation for afterschool activities.

Washington Greene County School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of 150 employees from 40 to 29 hours.

Eastern Greene County School Corporation announced that all of their employees who aren't receiving health insurance will have their hours cut to 28 hours a week.

Dubois County School was forced to reduce the hours for instructional assistants, cafeteria employees, and custodial staff.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of these employees already receive health insurance either through their spouse or other sources, and many of them have worked for their school corporation for many years.

School corporations don't have the luxury of raising taxes to pay for these

provisions of the Affordable Care Act. They are not a major business that can raise their prices.

School corporations simply can't afford the Affordable Care Act. These Hoosiers work every day with students, and because of this provision in the Affordable Care Act, our students will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority whip. Maybe after he expresses what makes common sense, our Republican friends may change their minds, and so I yield for the hard work he has done in this area, and good luck.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the chairman in exile of the Ways and Means Committee and his confidence in my ability to change minds is wonderful, but probably overstated. I regret that, but I will try anyway.

The previous speaker said that people will be forced to reduce hours. Now, they will only be forced to reduce hours from 40 to 39, as opposed to 30 to 29. In other words, if you work 39 hours a week, you won't have to be covered.

You won't have to have health care insurance, and somebody else will pay their bill, maybe Medicaid, depending upon how much they make. Maybe all of us will pay that extra thousand dollars in our premium so the uninsured can be funded; or maybe the other employers who do, in fact, believe it is good to offer their employees health insurance, even though they only work 39 hours a week, somebody else will pay the bill.

That is what has been happening with employers who don't provide health care insurance. Their competitors who do are in an unfair position.

Why did we choose 30 hours a week? We chose 30 hours a week, Mr. Speaker, because in surveying the private sector employment field, we found that 29 hours was perceived to be the litmus test for 29 hours or less being part time; so we picked 30 hours, which was more than the average in the private sector.

Now, we have a bill that is the 52nd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, this obsession with undermining the access to affordable, quality health care by the American people.

This bill changes the definition of full-time employee in a way that would make approximately 1 million Americans lose their employer-sponsored coverage.

Do we care? Do 1 million Americans make a difference to us? Do 1 million Americans not having the availability of the assurance that they and their families have health coverage, does that matter to us?

Or are they all part of the 47 percent who aren't going to vote for some of us

anyway—the proposition is—so why worry about them?

In addition, it would increase the number of uninsured by as many as half a million people, and it would increase the deficit by \$74 billion. A million people lose their employer-sponsored care, half a million people would continue to be uninsured, and \$74 billion is the loss in revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is because the legislation provides an incentive for some employers to redefine work hours, so that more employees would be categorized as part-time.

In other words, you work in the United States of America 39 hours, and you are part-time.

Under this bill, more than five times as many workers would be put at risk of having their employers just slightly reduce their hours to avoid providing them with health insurance.

That would be a change that subverts the goals of the Affordable Care Act, and it is not going to help grow our economy either; but more importantly, it subverts the quality of life, the confidence, the assurance, if you will, of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this legislation. I urge us to confirm the fact that we believe Americans in the richest country on the face of the Earth ought to have access to affordable, quality health care and that everybody would participate in that objective.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this bill, the Affordable Care Act that the President calls ObamaCare, clearly would not insure every American in the country.

Dropping somebody from 39 hours down to 29 hours is effectively a loss of 10 hours of work per week. Over the course of a month, that is the loss of an entire week's work of wages.

For the life of me, I can't understand why the very same individuals who embraced all of the three dozen or so administrative changes to this law without hesitation will not work together in a bipartisan fashion because this is a bipartisan bill to restore the hours and income of those who need it most during the worst economy since the Great Depression.

With that, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman YOUNG for his superb management of this bill and for his expertise in this area.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, which would change the health care law's definition of full-time employee from 30 hours per week to the traditional 40 hours per week.

That is 8 hours a day, times 5 days in the workweek, 40 hours, the traditional

workweek, empowering hardworking middle class men and women to earn additional wages otherwise denied to them under the health care law.

Not long ago, I spoke to a constituent from Basking Ridge, New Jersey, the congressional district I have the honor of representing, whose son works at a grocery store.

This young man was told he could only work 29 hours a week. Despite the company wanting him to work more and pay him more, it could not permit employees to exceed the health care law's arbitrary definition of full-time status. This young man from Basking Ridge must work less and earn less because of the health care law.

Too many Americans are experiencing significantly reduced wages and hours worked because of the law. H.R. 2575 will protect existing jobs by removing some of the uncertainty facing employers and employees and help America's job creators put people back to work.

I urge passage of H.R. 2575.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his leadership and years of service and his understanding of this issue.

I heard his debate on the floor of the House, which would drive many of us as Members of Congress to come and join you because of the literalness and the straightforwardness of your argument.

Frankly, I think that is the challenge we have this afternoon, wondering how many Americans even understand what we are doing because it is a numbers game. I have heard the stories of my colleagues, and I am absolutely empathetic, and I am sympathetic.

All of us have young people working, single parents working, husband and wife working. Maybe there are two working in a grocery store.

I think the problem with this legislation is that we are giving a pass to businesses who, in actuality, we are providing them with an opportunity to provide enhanced benefits to their hardworking workers.

□ 1530

This is a threshold question. The Affordable Care Act defined a full-time job as 30 hours. So it means that if you have 50 employees that are at 30 hours or above, you provide them with health insurance. But let me remind you, it is the Affordable Care Act. That means that these individuals, if you don't provide them, you have the opportunity to get into a pool or you can find insurance that fits that level of 50 workers. This does not apply if you have one worker; it doesn't apply if you have two workers. It is a threshold.

So what my friends are telling me is that, if you can afford 50 workers, you are dead broke. Then you have to take that 50th worker and drive him or her into the ground and leave them crawling out of your business at 29½ or 28 simply because you don't want to do the right thing. That is why this bill is so baffling.

In the Rules Committee, I offered two amendments to try to make it better to indicate that commuting time would be included as part of your 40 hours, or that we should delay this bill until we fully appreciate and understand the overall impact of whether or not it, in fact, undermines hardworking Americans who are in hardworking businesses. We are just passing this bill and have no clue as to whether or not this is going to be something that undermines businesses that have 50 employees.

Now, this is the backdrop of what they are doing. I even offered the point, Mr. RANGEL, of why not a tax incentive so that these businesses with 50 employees can keep the 50 employees at 30 hours and get a benefit for providing them with health insurance; and when I say that, one that is pointed to the fact that you have 50 employees and you are willing to give insurance. As it is now, we know that the individual employees will get tax relief.

But 7 million people have enrolled, Mr. Speaker. The fact that we had a record-breaking access to the Affordable Care Act, or interest, this bill seems to be the complete wrong direction to go. It is wrongheaded. I would ask my colleagues to vote against the bill that destroys the working people of America and puts them on their knees to work less hours.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2575, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2014."

This bill represents the 52nd time that House Republicans have tried to scuttle or impede the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–51.

The Affordable Care Act, which has been passed by both the House and Senate, signed by President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and ratified by the voters in the 2012 presidential election, is here to stay.

It is long past time that House Republicans abandon their quixotic quest to derail a law that is bringing so much peace of mind to millions of Americans and will reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion.

The Affordable Care Act is working. For example, in my State of Texas:

1. 5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012. In the first eleven months of 2013 alone, an additional 1,683,800 people with Medicare have received at least one preventive service at no out of pocket cost.

2. The up to 10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about

being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

3. Approximately 5,189,000 Texans have gained expanded mental health and substance use disorder benefits and/or federal parity protections.

4. 4,889,000 uninsured Texans will have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

5. As a result of new policies that make sure premium dollars work for the consumer, not just the insurer, in the past year insurance companies have sent rebates averaging \$95 per family to approximately 726,200 consumers.

6. In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities have saved on average \$866 on prescription medications as the health care law closes Medicare's so-called "donut hole."

7. 357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

8. Individuals no longer have to worry about having their health benefits cut off after they reach a lifetime limit on benefits, and since in January, 7,536,000 Texans will no longer have had to worry about annual limits, either.

9. Health centers have received \$293,038,000 to provide primary care, establish new sites, and renovate existing centers to expand access to quality health care. Texas has approximately 400 health center sites, which served about 1,079,000 individuals in 2012.

I oppose this bill because its effect would be to deny employer provided health insurance to hard working employees who work more than 30 hours but less than 40 hours per week.

If this bill were to become law in its current form, the health security of 10.2 percent of the workforce, or approximately 19.8 million workers, would be placed at risk.

I offered two amendments to H.R. 2575 that would prevent this travesty but regrettably neither was made in order by the Rules Committee.

Jackson Lee Amendment #1 would have improved this bad bill by amending the bill's 40-hour work week definition to include the employee's average commuting time in the computation of hours worked for purposes of determining "full-time employment."

Commuting time has become a major issue for those who work hourly wage jobs because their workday is much longer.

According to the Bureau of the Census nearly 8.1 percent of American workers commute 60 minutes or longer.

In 2011, almost 600,000 full-time workers had "mega-commutes" of at least 90 minutes and travel 50 miles or more from their homes. The daily average one-way travel to work for employees nationally is 25.5 minutes, and 1 out of 4 workers cross county lines to reach their jobs.

Jackson Lee Amendment #2 would have amended the bill by delaying the effective date of the bill until the first month after there has been two consecutive quarters in which the national unemployment rate is below 5 percent, which would indicate the Nation has reached a full employment economy.

Our Nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that health insurance is a personal responsibility with the enactment of

the Affordable Care Act. The law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program because it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

This week all over the Nation, over 4 millions of Americans took the first step toward taking control of their lives by purchasing their first personal or family health insurance policy.

Over the course of the sign-up process for the Affordable Care Act tens of thousands of visitors each day shopped the website and over 7.1 million people were added to private insurance roles as customers or have enrolled into Medicaid.

Despite problems with the initial rollout of the online health insurance registration process, people were patient and persistent about getting coverage for themselves and their families.

I have held many events in my District to inform and connect people with Navigators and Community Health Centers to support the message that it was time to get health insurance for yourself and your family.

Why with 60 legislative days remaining in the Second Session of the 113th Congress before the end of the 2014 fiscal year, we are still seeing attempts to end the Affordable Care Act is a mystery to the American public who are voting with their own healthcare dollars for Obamacare.

H.R. 2575 proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by redefining a full-time employee for purposes of providing health insurance to only those workers who work a 40-hour work week.

Mr. Speaker, few hourly workers in low-wage jobs work a 40-hour work week. These employees often rely on government assistance, which amounts to a hidden tax break to employers.

Low waged workers often rely upon public housing assistance, SNAP, WIC, or Medicaid to make ends meet.

Health insurance should not be used as a status symbol, but a basic right for people who live in the world's most prosperous nation.

I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the Nation's health care system, but it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is a small vocal minority within the majority party that is causing headaches and heartaches to doctors and their patients.

I ask that my colleagues to join me in protecting workers by voting down this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record a letter of support for the Save American Workers Act from the National Grocers Association on behalf of their members and on behalf of their workers, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

NATIONAL GROCERS ASSOCIATION,
Arlington, VA, March 31, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, Washington, DC.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Democratic Whip, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER PELOSI, LEADER CANTOR, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOYER: The National Grocers Association (NGA) supports H.R. 2575, the Save American

Workers Act (SAW), a bill introduced by Representative Todd Young (R-IN) and championed by Representative Dan Lipinski (D-IL). The bill has broad support in the House, with 210 bipartisan co-sponsors. NGA strongly encourages the House to pass the bill with bipartisan support during the vote scheduled for the week of March 31. We commend Majority Leader Cantor for bringing H.R. 2575 to the Floor for what will hopefully be an overwhelming vote in support of the bill.

H.R. 2575 addresses one of the most problematic provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by amending the definition of a full-time employee, which the ACA currently defines as those averaging 30 hours a week. Left unchanged, this provision will have far reaching consequences on the independent supermarket industry. Simply put, 30 hours is not full-time and requiring employers to meet this new definition is one of the most significant challenges of the law, jeopardizing coverage for our true full-time workforce. The SAW Act seeks to amend this problematic provision by defining a full-time employee as those averaging 40 hours a week and treating full-time equivalents as full-time employees for the purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer. This is a win-win for both American employers and our nation's workforce.

Independent grocers face complex challenges in implementing the law all while operating on a profit margin of around 1 percent. They are committed to their workers, and 92% of independent grocers already provide health benefits to full-time employees. It is important that Congress work in a bipartisan manner to provide employers with important reforms such as the SAW Act before irreversible changes to the US job market occur. Maintaining the full-time level many employers use today is something both sides of the debate can agree would be better for job preservation and employee coverage. Reforms such as the SAW Act are vital to our businesses and to our goal of providing quality benefits and available hours to our employees. Independent retailers and wholesalers have a significant economic impact across nearly every community in America. Our industry is accountable for close to 1 percent of the nation's overall economy and is responsible for generating over \$131 billion in sales, 944,000 jobs, \$30 billion in wages, and \$27 billion in tax revenue. We are proud that the communities we serve are also the neighborhoods we live in.

Thank you for your support of this important issue. NGA looks forward to continuing to work with Congress to address this issue before the employer mandate is implemented in 2015. This is a critical issue for NGA and our member companies, and we will be key voting this vote and including it on our 2014 Legislative Scorecard. We remain appreciative of the reforms Congress has already made to amend the ACA to make the law workable for both employers and the American workforce.

Sincerely,

PETER J. LARKIN,
President and CEO.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, workers in western Pennsylvania and across the Nation are seeing their hours cut and wages reduced due to the employer mandate in President Obama's health care law. This mandate hurts our friends and neighbors who are working to provide for their families.

Last July, a mom working in the food service industry in Beaver County, Pennsylvania, told me about how her

hours had been cut nearly in half because of the employer mandate. Sadly, her story is not unique or an isolated incident.

Brian in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, called the office to let me know that his daughter would have her hours cut at a bridal shop. She is yet another victim of this 30-hour workweek rule.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the median hourly wage for someone working in sales in Pennsylvania was \$12.18 in 2013. Losing 10 hours a week will cost that worker almost \$6,000 annually.

Many small business owners want to add jobs and increase wages but cannot afford to because of the employer mandate. As Brandon from Ellwood City said: "Small companies like ours try to do the right thing for us. They probably won't be hiring someone who can really use a job."

Washington should be working to grow the economy and add jobs, not making it harder for employees to earn more and get ahead or for employers to hire more people. The Save American Workers Act will restore the traditional 40-hour workweek and help those who want the opportunity to work more hours and see their wages rise.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand in solidarity with these workers and support this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. YOUNG on his outstanding leadership in managing this bill, which is going to remove one of the most misguided and confusing provisions of the President's Affordable Care Act.

Everyone outside Washington knows that full time means 40 hours. Only Federal bureaucrats would try to redefine a commonly understood fact that is critical to millions of workers and employers nationwide.

The redefinition of full time to 30 hours under the health care law is not only confusing to hardworking Americans, it is confusing to the very government who changed the definition in the first place. Just last week, Mr. Speaker, news reports showed that on different forms of the Federal agencies and in different offices, full-time work was being described as 40 hours by some agencies, 30 hours by other departments, and 35 hours by still others.

By moving the goalposts on what is actually constituting full-time employment, this administration fundamentally changed the workplace for hourly workers, increasing the risk of lost hours and smaller paychecks for real people, for real workers, for real Americans who are losers under this law called ObamaCare.

The bipartisan Save American Workers Act, of which I am proud to cosponsor, is going to restore that 40-hour

workweek. I am proud to cosponsor it and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD letters of support for the Save American Workers Act from The Associated General Contractors of America on behalf of their workers and their members, and also a letter by the National Franchise Association on behalf of their members and workers, and I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), my colleague.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, February 3, 2014.

Re Support H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I am writing in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013. This act would repeal the 30-hour definition of "full-time employment" in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by replacing it with the more traditional 40-hour definition.

The construction industry is typically project-based, transitory and seasonal, which distinguishes it from other professional industries with more predictable hours. As a result, many construction employers rely on part-time, seasonal and variable-hour employees. In addition, the construction industry consists of many smaller employers with limited human resource and administrative staff. These two issues alone add layers of difficulty for a construction firm that is required to use the complex formulas in the ACA to determine whether or not it is considered a large employer under the law.

Despite the one-year delay of the reporting and enforcement provisions of the ACA, the law continues to add layers of administrative burdens for employers, while other regulations are yet to be issued. Replacing the definition of a full-time employee to the more commonly accepted 40 hours per week will, at the very least, reduce some of the complexity associated with the ACA.

AGC hopes you will support H.R. 2575 and provide some relief for construction employers across the country.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government Affairs.

NATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Kennesaw, GA, February 3, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
House Committee on Ways and Means.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of thousands of BURGER KING® franchisees across the country, we would like to express our strong support for H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013, scheduled for mark-up in the Ways and Means Committee tomorrow.

The National Franchise Association (NFA) represents independent BURGER KING® restaurant entrepreneurs in the United States who operate more than 5,300 franchised restaurants and employ almost 200,000 individuals across the nation. The NFA works side by side with member franchisee regional organizations, system suppliers, business partners and Burger King Corporation to promote economic growth and prosperity.

The NFA strongly supports the Save American Workers Act, which amends "full-time" employment as defined in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("ACA") to working forty hours per week. The current 30-hour definition neither reflects current workplace standards nor the desire for flexible hours for both employers and employees in the Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) industry. By defining "full-time" as working 30 hours per week, our members may be forced to reduce hours, limit the number of full-time positions available and enforce rigid scheduling standards for their employees.

On behalf of thousands of small business owners, the NFA thanks you and the Ways and Means Committee for the opportunity to share our views. We look forward to working with you and the other members of this Committee to help small business owners create more jobs and grow their businesses.

Sincerely,

PETER J. COTTER,
Chair, NFA Govern-
ment Relations Com-
mittee.

MISTY CHALLY,
VP, Legislative Af-
fairs.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman YOUNG for his hard work.

ObamaCare is waging a war on work. ObamaCare's 30-hour rule gives employers an awful choice: cut hours or pay new taxes.

Fort Wayne Community Schools, our State's largest school district, announced last year that they would cut 610 part-time workers after estimating a \$10 million cost of compliance with ObamaCare.

My constituent, Todd Hollman, the Vice President of Pizza Hut and KFC of Fort Wayne, writes this:

Due to ACA, our company has been forced to reduce the number of part-time employees or face even greater penalties than we already will. Even by reducing the number of newly defined full-time employees, we will still incur nearly a \$1 million penalty in 2015.

While the Obama administration has delayed the employer mandate, businesses are still bracing themselves for ObamaCare's inevitable impact. Hooters don't need a part-time economy. We deserve a full-throated recovery. It is time to repeal ObamaCare's 30-hour definition of full employment.

I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. YOUNG, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2575. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2575 is postponed.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Today, we are here to talk about the Affordable Care Act, and especially the big week that we have had in this country in making sure that millions of Americans will now enjoy access to quality, affordable health care.

Last week, we had a chance to talk about this and had other Members from all over the country who represent wonderful districts come forward and talk about how the Affordable Care Act has been very beneficial to their constituents. Part of the discussion last week and in the previous months, really since October, has been about whether Americans would accept the Affordable Care Act and how many people would enroll and how many States would expand Medicaid.

The numbers are very clear that, despite all of the advertisements and the millions of dollars that has been spent on television promoting misinformation about the Affordable Care Act, demonizing this as socialism and other bad things, that despite all of that, the American people have clearly rejected that narrative, that they believe the Affordable Care Act and what it is doing for this country are good things and that in the wealthiest nation on Earth, as we are, that people should be able to afford health care, that they should not be denied because of pre-existing conditions, that students should be able to stay on their parents' plans after college, and that Medicaid for low-income Americans should be made more readily available.

Let's look at some of those numbers. We know, for example, that 7.1 million people ended up signing up for the Affordable Care Act in the exchanges. Now, that is on top of the 3 million students who can now stay on their parents' plans because of this act. That is on top of all of the States that expanded Medicaid to make sure that folks who don't make a lot of money, the vast majority of these people working hard day in and day out, that they are going to be covered, too.

There are still about 19 States, including my home State of Texas, that have chosen not to expand Medicaid. That has been such an incredible blow to the people of my State. For example, we have the highest percentage of people in the Nation that have no health care coverage.

On Monday, I was back home in San Antonio and there was a large enrollment fair, as there was in many cities throughout the country on Monday. It was probably about 6, 7, and this fair was going to close at 8. So I went over to see how it was going and to say hello to folks. There was a long line of people waiting. Families were there, two and three and four and five family members. People brought their young kids to enroll them in insurance.

One of the narratives during this debate has been this idea that has been pushed that this is just benefiting people who may be lazy or not working. One of the things that struck me when I was making my way through that line was that there were so many people there that had the insignia of the company that they work for or their uniform on. They told me that they had just come straight from work and how grateful they were that this was going to go on until 8 so that they had time to come after work.

It was really a stark reminder that—despite all of the stories or this idea of the makers and the takers in this country, or 47 percent of people versus 53 percent—the vast majority of people who are benefiting from this law, benefiting from things like Medicaid, are, in fact, not just takers, but are hard-working Americans who are powering our economy. All they want is a fair chance at the American Dream.

We talk a lot about freedoms in this body. The United States Congress is, of course, one of the main bodies in government that is entrusted with protecting American freedoms. So we talk about our First Amendment rights, whether it is freedom of expression, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, or Second Amendment rights, other amendments, the right against self-incrimination, all of these things, all of the Bill of Rights enshrined in the Constitution. But I pose the question to those who continue to want to repeal the Affordable Care Act: What good are any of those rights that we are entitled to as Americans, that previous generations of Americans and this generation of Americans have fought so hard to preserve, what good is freedom of expression, freedom of religion, freedom of speech if you are stuck in a hospital bed sick, broke because you can't pay your hospital bills, worried about your family and your future?

Remember, that is not an uncommon situation for Americans over the years.

□ 1545

The biggest reason for personal bankruptcies before the Affordable Care Act was the fact that people were racking up these huge health care bills that they couldn't pay, and this happened for a few reasons. Sometimes people just couldn't afford the insurance for their primary care physicians—the doctors they would go see—or emergency room doctors, not doctors in some clinic or private practice. Sometimes, even if they could afford insurance, they were hitting lifetime caps—somebody with cancer, somebody with MS—somebody like my grandmother and my mother with diabetes, who suffer from complications. My grandmother, before she passed away from congenital heart failure because of diabetes, had her leg amputated.

There are so many people who can't enjoy the freedoms that we are supposed to be able to enjoy because they can't afford health care coverage, so

they have ended up not going to the doctor for many years. They have put off going to the doctor for a long time because, if they went without insurance to the doctor, then they wouldn't be able to make their mortgage payments or to pay their rent or pay their car bills, cars that they need in order to get to work. These are the common experiences of millions of Americans, not just of low-income Americans—certainly, low-income Americans—but also of Americans in the middle class, who power our Nation and power our economy.

I want us to consider the success of the Affordable Care Act. Of course, there was the Web site that had a tough rollout, and a lot of people doubted whether the program would be successful. This has shown also that the Affordable Care Act is about more than just a Web site that had a glitch. Again, the fundamental reason that this law has passed is that America is the wealthiest nation on Earth, and for generations, other countries with a lot less money have been able to provide and make available health care to their citizens a lot better than the United States of America has.

Consider this: with the Affordable Care Act, up to 129 million Americans who have preexisting health conditions, including up to 17 million children, no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or being charged higher premiums due to their health statuses. Again, you might have a woman who is 55 years old or 60 years old. She loses her job that gave her insurance, so now she tries to find another job, and tries to buy insurance, and she is rejected. She tries to go on to the individual market, and finds that she can't afford the prices on the individual market.

What is that person to do? A lot of them are suffering from chronic diseases.

In south Texas, for example, we have an incredibly high rate of diabetes. In other parts of the country, in other communities, it is other diseases, but whatever it is, these ailments are common, and they are forcing people often-times into bankruptcy, into not being able to pay their bills or in not being able to get health care coverage. So lifting the lifetime caps has made a mountain of difference for people. It has helped ease their minds, and it has also made things more fair.

Yesterday, the President was pretty very forceful in his comments. I think they did the press conference in the Rose Garden, but I was on an airplane, so I couldn't watch the press conference, but I got to see some of the clips. He made a comment that really struck me, which is that the Affordable Care Act is here to stay. This law is not going anywhere despite all of the opponents and despite the millions of dollars that have been spent on television for misinformation and demonizing this law.

The reason it is not going anywhere is not just because of the political re-

ality. I mean, the politics, really, are tough on both sides. The country had been evenly divided for a long time. The reason that it is not going anywhere is because of the human reality, because we want fewer people going bankrupt because they are hitting lifetime caps and their insurance companies won't pay for their bills anymore. It is because you want more people who are not using the emergency rooms as their only way to get medical care and putting off ailments and diseases because, if they go to the doctor, they know that a month later or 3 weeks later they are going to run up these huge bills, and they know they can't pay them.

By the way, many folks have pointed this out, but certainly, when we had a dialogue last week, I pointed out again that there is a measure here also of personal responsibility, of people getting insurance in the same way that many States require you to get auto insurance. Why do States require you to get auto insurance? It is because, if you rear-end somebody, somebody has got to fix his car. In many public hospitals throughout the Nation, certainly in Texas—in San Antonio, for example—what happens routinely, often-times not from San Antonio but from surrounding counties, is that these folks come in, and you can't deny anybody emergency room coverage. You have to treat them. Then you send them a bill, and they can't pay the bill. They don't have insurance, and they can't pay the bill. Guess who pays the bill? That bill has to be paid somehow. The taxpayers end up paying that bill. Somebody has to eat that cost, and it is not the hospital. They pay a fraction of it, but those costs are spread, and all Americans have to pay them State by State, county by county. So this is a way that people can not only benefit from the Act but can also take a measure of personal responsibility for their own health care coverage.

That is why in the 1980s and in the 1990s, which was before this issue became so political and before President Obama was inaugurated in 2009, that originally the kind of legislation that we now know as ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, was actually legislation that was promoted by the very conservative Heritage Foundation. It was considered to be a conservative idea in the same way that somebody getting car insurance—taking personal responsibility in case you hit somebody on the road—is thought to be a conservative idea. You are going to own up to your responsibilities. It has been very interesting over the last 4 years and even over the last few months to see the evolution of the arguments about health care coverage and about the Affordable Care Act and about how politics sometimes and often has trumped public policy.

In a minute, I would like to yield to my good friend from California, MARK TAKANO, but before I do that, I want to share with you just a few stories of

people from my area, from Texas, who said that I could share their stories with them and how grateful they are that they are now able to afford health care.

The first one is a woman named Magdalena. She is a substitute teacher and had a hard time transitioning to San Antonio since moving from Del Rio. Del Rio is a city right along the Texas-Mexico border. It is about 2½ hours from San Antonio. She has dedicated herself to taking care of her family, and she often puts her family in front of herself. Like many mothers, she was worried about her health as she moved into her senior years. She was skeptical about trying to fill out an application, but she eventually came to an Enroll SA event. Many cities had Enroll SA or Enroll Austin or Enroll Dallas. After sitting down with a counselor, she was able to get a plan for 5 cents a month. This is a woman who had previously been unable to get health care coverage. She returned to the registration table and wept tears of joy, with her eyes filled with hope, and the volunteers wept along with her. Her face just lit up because now her life was truly changing.

Like many others, Magdalena is a hardworking American, somebody who has taken care of her family, who is going to work day in and day out, who is not asking for very much—just a chance to enjoy the freedoms that we talk about here in Congress a lot.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague from California, Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you so much to the gentleman from Texas, San Antonio, and New Braunfels.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are talking about the Affordable Care Act. This is so, so important as we have seen this week 7 million-plus American enrollees, and I know there are still some who tried to get in at the very end and are in the pipeline. I am hoping we push even closer to 8 million new enrollees into the Affordable Care Act.

It is interesting because we over here on the Democratic side have really been working to enroll people—we have been working to talk to people about how important it is to have a health care plan—while at the same time we have seen from the other side 50-plus votes to try to undercut, to undermine, to eliminate the ACA, but here we are. They were repealing. We were enrolling.

California's enrollment numbers surpassed 1.2 million people this past Monday, which is more than double of any other State. On top of that, the expansion of Medi-Cal, which is our Medicaid piece of this, has covered another 1.5 million low-income families, so we are pretty excited. California looked at this and said, this Medi-Cal plan—this plan of having a health care plan for lower income families, for the members in these lower income families—is so important. For the first 3 years, it is

paid 100 percent from the Federal Government.

So, if you are sitting in a State like California and if you have 1.5 million new families who didn't have health care before that was paid for, they were putting up with being sick, doing what we call in Spanish "aguantamos." If you got sick, you wouldn't go to the doctor. You wouldn't go and you wouldn't go, and you would work through. You would go to work, and you would be sick. You wouldn't go until, finally, you couldn't take it anymore. You were really, really sick. Then where would you go? You would go to the emergency room, which is the highest cost place in the entire health care system. Instead of putting up with not having health care—instead of aguantamos—we now have 1.5 million families who are in Medi-Cal and, again, as of Monday, 1.2 million people who are in what we call our exchange, Covered California.

This is very, very important, but there is also another piece of this that is incredibly important, which is that now we have to work with people. Now that we have enrolled them for the year, we need to work with people who have never before had a health care plan. They don't know what a primary doctor is. They don't even know what a specialist is. They don't know what the process is to go. They don't know about getting a baseline. Go and get an annual physical for free under these plans. This is for free. We have to teach them.

So you go in. You get a relationship with a doctor. You get a physical. You get a baseline. You get your blood drawn. For someone like me, that is incredibly important because, for example, diabetes runs in my family. My granddad died of it, my grandma, my aunt, her five kids. It is 3½ times more likely to be in Latinos than in the average Anglo in America. It is being able to go and get blood work done so that can you see where you are, whether you have the propensity to get diabetes, for example, because diabetes in over 50 percent of the cases can be stopped; it can be turned back. It is about having some nutritional understanding, being able to eat the right way, sequencing your food, exercising after you eat—just a 15-minute walk. There were just two studies that were released this past May that said, if you have a propensity for diabetes but if you walk 15 minutes after you eat, you can cut that propensity by almost 50 percent.

This is information that our communities do not have. Low-income, immigrant communities in particular are less likely to have this kind of information. Now, if they have health care plans and if we teach them how to go and get that baseline—get their annual physicals, get their pap smears, get their mammograms—and if there is something wrong, let's work on fixing it, and it takes personal responsibility to do that.

□ 1600

I have to get up early in the morning and go and run. I have to go to the gym to ensure that, since the propensity is high for me, I don't get that because it takes some personal responsibility—personal responsibility not to eat pizza all the time, and things of that sort, yes, personal responsibility.

It takes a health care plan, it takes knowledge, it takes access. These places have to be close by. We have to have clinics and doctors signed up into these plans so we can go to them. It takes cultural knowledge, as you know, being from San Antonio. Some of it is a language barrier. Some of it is just understanding how our community works and how we spread it by word of mouth, rather than go to computers to find our information.

Knowing all of this will help us ensure that, now that people are enrolled, they begin to use the plans effectively, and when they use them effectively, we drive down that cost curve that was happening. In California, on average, it was a 17 percent increase in medical health care costs on an annual basis. That was not sustainable.

The only people who could have liked the old system were the wealthy or the healthy. If you got sick, you had the money, or you never got sick; but today, we can fix these things.

Today, we can fix these things by moving forward with these health care plans and with teaching people how to use them efficiently and effectively, so that all of society becomes stronger and healthier, and that is why we voted to put this in. That is why we have worked so hard.

I am so thrilled that the gentleman from Texas wanted to discuss this issue today.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congresswoman. Thank you for your passion over the many years on health care and many other issues, and you raised several wonderful points, but there are a few in particular that I wanted to mention.

We debate our national debt and deficit here a lot. Since the Affordable Care Act was passed, as we know, health care has been the biggest driver of our debt. The Affordable Care Act has actually slowed the cost of health care, the slowest growth that we have seen in decades.

So this is something that has actually been good and will be good for our fiscal health in this country. Thank you for alluding to that.

Also, you mentioned that in many of the communities we represent—not only in California or in Texas, but many places—ailments like diabetes are things that affect so many people in our neighborhoods and our cities, but it is not just diabetes.

In other places, it could be cancer or sickle cell anemia or multiple sclerosis. All of those patients will now find a lot more relief because the United States Congress passed this bill.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I couldn't agree with you more. There are pockets of this.

I just want to leave with one story. A few years ago, we had this one company who was a lensmaker kind of company. It was somebody who had retail stores, and you would go in and get your eyes checked. They would grind lenses and get glasses for you. Usually, they could do it in one stop, in 2 or 3 hours, et cetera.

They said: Let's do this in your area, LORETTA; let's hold a health care fair.

We had a lot of different types of people offering services, and they said: For the first 400 people who show up, we will have ophthalmologists there—medical eye doctors—and we will take a look and see what is going on with people. If we need to grind lenses, we'll grind lenses for them and give them free glasses.

Because even if you had a health care plan, most people didn't have vision or dental, so people were not buying glasses. They couldn't afford it.

I got there at 7:30 in the morning to this health care fair. It started at 8. There were 600 people in line already, so we gave coupons for these people to be able to walk into one of those retail stores and get the service for free. We kept the first 400.

One of the young ladies that worked with me stayed all day with one of the doctors, making sure the patients were coming in and out, giving him the things he needed, et cetera. At the end of the day, the doctor turned to her and said: Do you know that 80 percent of the people that we saw today had diabetes or were about to get diabetes?

They didn't even know it because one of the first symptoms for diabetes is blurry vision, so these people were thinking they are getting old and their vision is kind of going, but the reality was they were sick.

They didn't know it because they did not have health coverage, and, like I said, that is a disease that you can really get rid of or eliminate in your life if you work at it.

These people need that knowledge. These people need that ability to walk into the doctor and to get their blood tested and to see what is going on, so that we can tell them: if you don't change what is going on in your life, you are going to be diabetic.

By the way, the plans before, if you had diabetes and you had to have your leg chopped off, for example, we would pay for that. You see what I am saying?

We wouldn't be paying to let them know you may be getting diabetes or you have diabetes; we would pay after the fact to chop off their legs. Or, if they went blind, we would have them at home because, now, they couldn't work.

So it is going to make Americans healthier. When Americans are healthier, they will be more productive. They will have less sick days. It will be good for industry.

So I am really thrilled to have voted for the ACA. I am really thrilled, 4 years-plus now, and that we are seeing it now, at the ground level, with people signed up for plans; and now, we have just got to make sure they go and use these, so that we can get them healthy.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congresswoman SANCHEZ.

Now, I would like to yield to my friend from Houston, Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the convener of this Special Order and the colleagues I have heard since I have come to the floor, like Congresswoman SANCHEZ.

Congressman CASTRO, thank you very much. Coming from similar territory—the State of Texas—I just hope that you will allow me, just for a moment, to juxtapose the present pending bill on the floor.

I heard you speak of the bill, H.R. 2575, as well, and with all due respect to the proponent of the bill, it is confusing. It is confusing in the backdrop of the number that you have standing alongside of you, 7 million Americans and growing.

Because there were many Americans who were in the queue—in the line, when March 31 came, and because of President Obama, they will now have extended the opportunity to finish the work, and I was with a lot of navigators and people enrolling over the weekend. They were excited about being able to finish the task.

In Texas alone, that was the epicenter of unemployed. I keep saying, “unemployed.” Certainly, it has unemployed persons as well. There are 164,000 without unemployment insurance, which really is what baffles me about this effort at repeal and this effort of determining that, with 30 hours of hard work, you can't get health insurance.

In the State of Texas, 5.198 million individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one preventative health care service, such as mammograms, birth control, and immunizations. That is for people with private insurance.

Also, 10.695 million individuals with preexisting conditions like asthma, cancer, or diabetes, including 1.6 children, will no longer have to be worried about being denied coverage in our own State alone.

As well, 5.189 million Texans have gained expanded mental health and substance abuse or use disorder benefits, and 4 million-plus uninsured Texans will have new health insurance options through the idea of going into the marketplace.

Also, 233,000 seniors and people with disabilities have saved \$866 in prescription medications, and 357,000 young adults have gained health insurance, and 7 million Texans will no longer have to worry about annual limits. That is, of course, those who are uninsured and who can access the new Affordable Care Act insurance.

The other point is that, over these last 2 days, we have seen the reality of Americans clamoring for health insurance, with 4 million people accessing the healthcare.gov Web site.

And let me make this as breaking news—because this is what we were hearing from those opposing it—80 to 85 percent of those who have enrolled have paid their first premium. This is not a story of I have enrolled and you never hear from me again; this is a story of serious decisions being made by serious persons.

Let me offer, as well, some of the tragedies over the years—and I am very pleased to have cast that vote for the Affordable Care Act. I have been to any number of townhall meetings to share it with my constituents, some of whom who did not understand or agree.

In the course of the hearings, I have heard of so many stories that we don't repeat anymore, like the little girl that had leukemia. Her parents took her over and over again to the insurance company to get the opportunity for her to be covered. She had a pre-existing disease. She had no coverage. She ultimately lost her life.

I believe—I don't want to call up facts that are not accurate—they even took her to the insurance company's office to plead for her to be covered. It was at that point near the end of her life, which she shortly thereafter lost.

We have the mother who came to us and said yes, her son had a difficult history. He was a trained lawyer. He was doing pro bono work. He was in Atlanta, Georgia. Frankly, he had gotten hepatitis. Because he had no health care, the only coverage he could get was from going into an emergency room. He had waited too long.

He was going into the emergency room, being the only source of health care. If he had had the ability to go to a doctor, in spite of his history of drug abuse at that time—a trained lawyer—he would have been able to maintain his life.

My last one is the issue of a young resident who took a summer position in Atlanta, Georgia, but his health care was in a 25-mile perimeter around Washington, D.C.

He fell ill with kidney disease during that summer. His father was a doctor. He was a student. He didn't have the ability to stay on his parents' insurance. His insurance was a school-based insurance that said it could only be around the school.

Congressman, his father had to drive hours to pick him up and put him in his car and pray for his survival and get him back into the perimeter of his health insurance.

This is what we lived with before the Affordable Care Act in 2010 and before the President ultimately signed it, and so I am baffled as to why, for the 52nd time, there is an attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act with H.R. 2575.

Let me just say that the importance of this Special Order is to emphasize whose side Members are on. I am on

the side of those who are clamoring for good health care and who have children who need good health care. I am on the side of those who need the expanded Medicaid and ask the State of Texas to do it.

As I close, just on this bill, H.R. 2575, I am still trying to understand what it means to tell someone who works full time, 30 hours a week, in a company that has 50 employees, that you cannot get health care.

So to the employers out there, frankly, I believe that some people are speaking for you that may not be really speaking for you. Because when you pay your employees and they get health care, they have more cash to buy your goods.

More people have income to come back to the grocery store, come back to the restaurant, come to the small clothing store, or to buy flowers.

Why would you deny employees health care so that they can get sick, go to the emergency room, and have days off? It doesn't make sense.

I think this bill is way before its time. There is no evidence that we need to reduce the hours of working Americans. There is evidence that we should pass unemployment insurance for those who are chronically unemployed. We need to do that.

There is evidence to raise the minimum wage, but there is no evidence that this is a problem of catastrophic moment that we are debating it for 4 hours on the floor.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman for his leadership on this question.

□ 1615

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE. Thank you for all of your work on this and many other issues. You are one of the most tireless folks, Republican or Democrat, who is involved in all the floor debates and amendments and proposing legislation. So thank you.

Just a few things that you mentioned. You were talking about the bill that we just discussed, and it was essentially saying that for sizeable businesses, not small businesses, because the small businesses are exempted from the requirements of the Affordable Care Act. That is worth repeating again. Small businesses are exempted from the requirements of the Affordable Care Act, so this was about larger businesses.

Instead of requiring that they offer health care coverage to their employees at 30 hours, the Republicans wanted to move it up to 40. One of the myths has been that all of these employers are reducing hours and cutting employees hours and this is hurting the workers. Well, the Congressional Budget Office, which both sides use as a neutral resource to figure out what's what, said that there is no evidence of that. There is no trend that says that part-time work versus full-time work is increasing because of the Affordable Care Act.

I also pointed out earlier in the discussion that part of the challenge in this economy is that American business has bounced back, but ordinary Americans still have not fully bounced back.

So, when we see that the stock market every other week, if not every other day, is hitting alltime highs and at the same time there are millions of Americans still struggling to find work, I think it is fair to ask why an employer shouldn't offer health care coverage to somebody that is working 32 or 35 hours a week.

Under the Republican plan, somebody that was working 39 hours a week, as STENY HOYER mentioned earlier, you wouldn't be offered health care coverage necessarily. And we believe that that is wrong. We believe that the freedoms that we would otherwise enjoy as Americans, those freedoms are harder to enjoy if you are sick and unhealthy and broke because of medical bills.

So the Affordable Care Act is not perfect and, quite frankly, nothing this Congress does, from health care to education to any other issue, is ever going to be perfect. If anybody is expecting perfection from this place, they are always going to be disappointed. But this is a bill that is absolutely a step in the right direction and one that we are going to continue to improve with the help of the American people, with the voices of the American people.

But I will tell you what. As I mentioned earlier, this law is not going to be repealed. We are not going to go backward. We are not going to go to the way things were because the way they were was not good, and this is much better.

Thank you, Congresswoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

If I could just make one final point. First of all, I am excited about the embracing by new Members like yourself who came out of State legislatures and knew how difficult it was to provide health insurance for our fellow Texans. But the embrace that you are now offering is one that gives us confidence that it will not be repealed, even though this is the 52nd time that it has been offered to repeal.

I just want to leave these facts for you as you continue your debate. This is a values question. This is a fairness question.

As you stand on the floor right now, the Budget Committee is meeting, with a budget as its underpinning, the underlying bill, that will give millionaires a \$200,000 tax cut, and yet we have a bill here on the floor that wants to take the living substance from under the feet of workers working 30 hours a week, that gives them the stability and the confidence that they have health insurance for companies that are 50 and above, 50 persons and above. That is not a small company. I can tell you, I would ask that employer: Are you going to get rid of Mrs. Smith, who has given you 10 years of hard work, and put her at 29 hours because you don't

want to give Mrs. Smith health insurance?

I think we are on the right side of the issue on this. The Affordable Care Act has helped seniors, it has helped single parents, it has helped individuals with preexisting disease, and it has helped young people who have surged into buying it. We should continue to embrace it and recognize that it has a value and it is going to turn lives.

My message to our Governor, if I can end on this note: Governor Perry, it is time to opt into the expanded Medicaid, which is part of the Affordable Care Act, which will give millions of others in the State of Texas their opportunity to benefit from good health care—being healthy and being able to work.

That is our challenge, and I look forward to working with you on these issues.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you.

I yield now to a wonderful legislator from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time.

I rise today to stage an intervention, an intervention for Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans. Now, this intervention is not because they are wearing goofy hats or are spray tanning too much. This intervention is over their obsession with repealing or delaying the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

Now, just this week, the open enrollment period ended, and it is estimated that more than 7 million Americans signed up for private health coverage through healthcare.gov or their State exchanges. That number does not include the millions of young adults who are staying on their parents' plans or those getting coverage through Medicaid for the first time. The open enrollment period was one of the final pieces of ObamaCare.

Now, millions of Americans finally have access to affordable coverage that can't be taken away just because they get sick. Despite that, Speaker BOEHNER and the House Republicans are committed to fighting a battle that they have lost and have scheduled the 52nd vote to repeal or delay ObamaCare.

The Affordable Care Act passed the House. It passed the Senate and was signed by the President and has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Despite millions of dollars being funneled into misleading ads that discouraged people from getting covered, this is a law that millions of Americans have embraced and have benefited from. We saw an incredible surge in the final days of open enrollment, with consumers reportedly lining up around the block at some sign-up centers.

But if you talk to Republicans, it is clear they are still in the first stage of denial, denial of the facts, denial of the benefits, denial that our health care system is finally doing what it is supposed to do for the first time in a long time. My Republican colleagues must

stop making excuses and blaming others. They have put themselves in this position.

Even in the first few days of the roll-out, when the system was admittedly struggling, Republicans were predicting ObamaCare's complete and total failure. JOHN BOEHNER called the initial numbers "a symbol of the failure of the President's health care law." My colleague from California, Congressman DARRELL ISSA, said, "It is time for the President to finally acknowledge ObamaCare isn't working and to delay the law."

Funny how they believed the numbers then, because they seemingly have doubts about what is being reported now. According to Senator JOHN BARASSO, the administration was "cooking the books."

To my Republican friends, I want to say: this is a safe place. We are here to help. Your addiction to repealing ObamaCare and peddling conspiracy theories about the law are not doing any good for yourselves or for the American people.

Stop standing on the wrong side of history. Let's move on. Let's accept that ObamaCare is the law of the land. Let's get back to being productive as a legislative body.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman. Thank you for your comments, and also thank you for all of you in California who have been one of the States that has shown the Nation what is possible in helping to offer insurance to the hardworking men and women of your State.

We, as Americans, we appreciate that.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, it is a point of pride that even in my area of California, the Inland Empire, my county has met, has exceeded its enrollment goals under Covered California, and just a few days ago we had reached a million in California alone. It is because we have a State legislature and a Governor who cooperated from the beginning. I don't understand any Governor or any State legislature that would intentionally try to keep low-income people from getting coverage.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. You make a wonderful point. California and several other States have had the benefit of a State legislature and a Governor who have been helpful in making sure that the Affordable Care Act, health care coverage, is available to their residents.

In places like the State where I live, in Texas, you have a Governor, State legislators, both Senators who are actively working and campaigning against the Affordable Care Act. So, many of us, not just elected officials but others who are trying to make sure that people have health care coverage, have faced a very strong headwind when trying to get the word out about the Affordable Care Act.

I told a story earlier about a woman who showed up at an enrollment fair in San Antonio and she ended up being

able to provide insurance for herself and her family, but she went there and she was skeptical at first. Well, part of the reason she was skeptical is because there has been so much misinformation about this law and so much demonization about the law that I am not surprised that a lot of Americans would say, hey, you know, that thing doesn't sound like a good thing. It sounds like a bad thing.

Mr. TAKANO. There has been so much distortion. And to my way of thinking, it is diabolical to spend money on distorting ads to confuse people intentionally, to get young people to not sign up for the law, to undermine the law in that way.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. That is right. You bring up a good point.

There was a group that was specifically set up to go on to college campuses, funneled millions of dollars to go on to college campuses to convince college students not to enroll in the Affordable Care Act. That is just amazing to me.

Mr. TAKANO. Fortunately, I can tell you stories of someone who is under 30, one of those young invincibles, but who was wise enough to know that it made sense for a young person to sign up because it was so very affordable, and he convinced his employer that she needed to take a look at what the exchange had to offer.

As it turned out, he discovered he had a very serious condition, and he was one of those young people who discovered that they did need health insurance and that he was facing far larger bills than if he didn't have any coverage at all.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. California also, I believe, expanded Medicaid, and that is something that Texas didn't do. In fact, I remember several months back, when the State legislative session in Texas was still going on, and usually it goes to about the end of May or early June. We went down there and we were doing a press conference, and at the same time, the Governor and the Senators, Lieutenant Governor, all Republicans were doing their press conference.

Our junior Senator, Senator CRUZ, compared folks who need Medicaid and accept Medicaid to drug addicts, compared them to drug addicts. And the State's leadership implied that—not implied, said—allowing Medicaid to low-income Texans was like getting people hooked on sugar or drugs.

Mr. TAKANO. Forgive me. I may be speaking—I don't think what I am saying is an exaggeration, but I see that the denial of the expansion of Medicaid by some of these States is nothing less than a war on the poor. I don't know how else to say it.

Twenty-four percent of my congressional district were uninsured before the ACA. I have seen charts and maps of congressional districts color-coded, and I have seen many of those districts in Texas that are at the same level of uninsured as my congressional district.

In my congressional district, we benefit greatly from the expansion of our version of Medicaid, which is Medi-Cal. And the beauty is that the expiration is not to end it as of the 31st of March. People who qualify for Medi-Cal can continue to sign up for it year-round.

But to think that in Texas that it is not available to people who are low-income, to me, is unconscionable.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I appreciate those words. Unfortunately, in Texas there are a lot of people suffering needlessly, hardworking people. These are not lazy people. These are people that are going to work day in and day out, but they are suffering because their State leadership—even though Texas was going to get up to \$90 billion for Medicaid expansion. The Federal Government was providing the funds through 2017 and then providing 90 percent of the funds after that. Despite the fact that it made economic sense, still, the State's leadership refused to do it.

□ 1630

I think it is worth mentioning a few other things. A lot of us, we saw there were long lines on Monday, March 31 of people waiting to enroll in the Affordable Care Act. It is worth noting that anybody that started that process on March 31 but was not able to complete it has until April 15 to actually finish it off. So the 7.1 million number of the number of folks that have enrolled will very likely, I would think, go up by at least a few hundred thousand people.

Mr. TAKANO. At least the folks in Texas, who can sign up with the Federal exchange, can get insurance if they are online, but it is unfortunate that those low-income Texans have no place to go.

I will just say to the folks in California, those low-income people who can still qualify for Medi-Cal, that you can still sign up. There is not a deadline for you. You are presumed qualified if you meet a certain income test. So the effects of the Affordable Care Act are still going to continue in my State for those who need health care the most and those who have heretofore not had access to medical care.

It has been a pleasure sharing this time with you on the floor, Representative CASTRO.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you very much, Congressman.

There is another benefit of the Affordable Care Act that I haven't talked about yet that is also very important to know. We know that 7.1 million people have signed up. Three million or more college students or young adults are able to stay on their parents' plans because of the Affordable Care Act. Millions more have benefited from Medicaid expansion. Millions of Americans also benefit because there is no longer lifetime caps. You know, you are not going to have somebody who is suffering from cancer in a hospital bed have a doctor or an administrative billing person from the hospital come talk

to you about the fact that you are about to hit your lifetime cap. So now, not only are you lying there sick in the hospital bed, but you are also thinking about how you are going to pay your mortgage and keep your kids in college. That is not going to happen anymore.

So when you hear people talk about repeal—and first of all, repeal with no plan to replace it. I mean, the only thing coming from the other side is, just get rid of this whole thing. There is no plan to replace it.

So I think what we owe the American people is, when we talk about repealing a law, especially something as important and big as this, I think it is a very fair and necessary question to ask: What are you going to replace it with? Are we going to go back to the old system, where that cancer patient lying in a hospital bed now is going to hit a lifetime cap with the insurance company so they are going to be told that they either have to leave the hospital or they are going to get stuck with \$250,000 of bills, and they have to sell their house because they can't afford it anymore? When you hear the word "repeal," you should understand that that is what is at stake, that is what we would go back to, the old system.

Until folks come up with an alternative—and in 4 years, there has been no alternative, and really, there is no reason to think that over the next 4 years there is going to be one. Unless you can come up with an alternative, then we are talking about going back to that time.

But the thing that I wanted to mention and something that is often overlooked here is that part of the Affordable Care Act, another benefit of it is that mental health care coverage is vastly expanded because of the Affordable Care Act. That is extremely important. Millions of families in this country, individuals and families, have either suffered themselves or have family members who suffer from serious depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, other mental health afflictions that—quite frankly, in America and many other countries of the world, for the longest time, we never took mental health issues as seriously as we have taken physical health issues.

So for a long time, people would tell you, oh, you are depressed. Well, you just need to snap out of it. Or they treated things like bipolar disorder very lightly. They thought somebody just had a bad attitude.

In Texas, in 2011, I and others worked on getting young people with serious emotional disturbances covered by insurance companies in Texas. And, you know, the Democrats are in a deep minority in Texas. The whole time I was there, for five terms, we were in a deep minority. So you would have a Republican-controlled legislature. And my bill went nowhere. It didn't go anywhere. It died. So serious emotional disturbances weren't covered. But under the Affordable Care Act, things like that will be.

The reason that was important was because families were coming to me—in my district office, there is one family in particular that came to me and said, We are scared of our son. Our son is a teenager, and he has gotten violent before. So we call the cops. The cops take him to the hospital. There is nowhere to keep him for any kind of long-term treatment because, by the way, the State provides inadequate resources for mental health care coverage. They can't really put him in jail unless he has really assaulted somebody. So there is just this cycle, where we are having this issue with our son, and we are scared to be in the same house with him. But we can't really do anything. And the law offers us no relief.

Well, one of the benefits of the Affordable Care Act is that serious emotional disturbances and many other mental health issues will now be taken more seriously, and they will be more covered by health care companies than they have ever been in the history of the United States. And that hasn't been a big focus because a lot of this has been about politics. And a lot of the milestones and, quite frankly, the celebrations about the more than 7 million people signing up, that has been the big focus of this whole thing. But we shouldn't overlook some of the things that haven't gotten as much attention.

For me, as somebody that worked on mental health legislation in Texas, and I know many other people, Republicans and Democrats, have worked on things like that—to the families who are dealing with situations like that, that is a big deal. That means a lot to them. And that is helping them out.

So, as Americans, when you hear folks talk about repealing this law, I hope that we all fully understand exactly what we would be going back to. And those legislators who propose repealing it are irresponsible if they don't provide to the American people a full alternative and an explanation for what that alternative would do for them and what it would cost for the country. You know what the Affordable Care Act is about. We have seen no plan on the other side.

So as I close, I would like to say "thank you" to all the Members of Congress from different places in the Nation who joined me today in talking about this milestone for the Affordable Care Act. I am very personally glad that over 7 million people have now signed up and are benefiting. And millions more are benefiting through Medicaid expansion, college students, and all of these people who won't be kicked off of insurance because they have hit lifetime caps. Or, you know, somebody that tries to get insurance, and the insurance company sends them a letter back saying, we can't insure you because you have a preexisting condition, or your doctor submits a bill to the insurance company, as it used to be, and the insurance company writes back

saying, Well, you know what, we are not going to cover that \$3,000 bill because you had a preexisting condition. That is what repeal would be about, going backward.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE STATE OF OUR CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to stand here today with my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and Mr. WENSTRUP from Ohio, behind me, in order to talk a little bit about not only the state of our country but of our Congress. When we came here 3 years ago, we were on a mission to get America back to work. We have watched now over the last 3 years. And some of the criticism that comes about all the time is, You know, you guys just aren't getting anything done. I hear people talk about not getting anything done, about being a do-nothing Congress, about not really pushing the agenda forward, about us not being able to get America back to work.

Well, today, Mr. MARINO, our colleagues, and I are going to be here in the position of myth-busters. This myth that somehow the House of Representatives—and I think the key to this is that there are actually two Chambers to this Congress. There is a House of Representatives and there is a Senate. In the House of Representatives, we have done incredible work over the last 3 years. We are talking about 220 House-passed bills that are stuck in the do-nothing Senate. And of those 220 bills, 30-plus of those bills are about job creation. They are about getting America back to work. They are about giving people confidence in the future that they can look forward and begin to plan their lives.

Now, we can't do it alone. And while we get criticism from the administration and as we look down the hall to the Senate, we start to wonder ourselves, what would it take to get America engaged in this process? What would it take to get our American citizens aware of what is actually going on in the Capitol? Why is it that we are stuck here? Why can't we move forward?

So today's exercise—for the next 60 minutes, Mr. MARINO, myself, and our other colleagues are going to have an opportunity to speak to the people of the United States to make sure that we expose this myth that this is a do-nothing Congress. No, no, no, no. This is not a do-nothing Congress. This is a Congress that has worked very hard. This is a Congress that has done monumental work to get our fellow Americans back to work.

The problem is, when you walk it down the halls and into the Senate, it

gets lost. It gets tabled. It doesn't get amended. It doesn't get discussed. It doesn't get debated. In fact, it doesn't do anything. It just collects dust.

So I welcome this opportunity to speak not just to this House but also to the people of America. And at this time, I would like my colleague and my good friend in Congress, Mr. MARINO from Pennsylvania, to also weigh in on this.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman KELLY. I appreciate this. It is an honor to be here with you, and it is an honor to be setting the record straight.

You know, I spent a couple minutes in here listening to my colleagues about what we are not doing and what they are doing. The facts and figures that they are throwing out are coming from the White House. They change on a regular basis. We will get into that stuff in a little bit.

But I want to hold up something and show it to the American people and then touch on it a little bit, about what we have done in the House of Representatives. What the Republicans have done in the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress—that is just last year and this year. That is not including the legislation that we passed in the 112th Congress, from 2011 to 2012.

I am holding in my hand here the names, the numbers, the dates, and the details of 220 bills that the House passed—220 bills. Some of it was with support from a handful of Democrats who saw that this is good legislation, that it will create jobs, it will keep taxes low. It does away with job-crushing regulation. It lets the private sector do what it does best. It allows the hardworking taxpayers to have a level playing field.

I am just going to recite some of the bills. I am not going to go over nearly all 220 bills that are sitting on Democrat Senate Leader HARRY REID's desk that he refuses to bring to the floor for a vote. I ask the Democrat leader: Senator REID, what are you afraid of? Why do you not bring these bills to the floor for a vote so the American people can see the legislation and how their Senators vote for it? They can see it right here in the House. They can go to our Web site. They can go to the congressional Web site. They can see how we voted on legislation.

I think it is despicable that one person in Congress can hold up 220 pieces of legislation and hide it from the American people. And do you know why he does it? Politics. There is an election coming up this year. He doesn't want his Democrat Senators to have a voting record. Well, that is why we are here. We are supposed to have a voting record. We are supposed to represent the American people.

Some of the legislation concerns energy, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, H.R. 2231; Northern Route Approval Act, H.R. 3; hydropower regulation; Energy Consumers Relief; Coal Residuals Reuse; Federal Lands; En-

ergy and Water appropriations; Department of Defense appropriations; Homeland Security appropriations; Preserving Work Requirements for Welfare Programs; the SKILLS Act; Student Success Act; the RAPID Act, which does away with regulation and time that prevents businesses from creating jobs. And who creates the jobs the best? The private industry.

□ 1645

Look, the Federal Government has a rough time keeping Amtrak on time, and they are always way over budget, and we are going to trust them with health care? We are going to trust the Federal Government with creating jobs when entrepreneurs are the best people, women and men, to do that?

Any time you want to see what legislation is on Mr. REID's desk, you just go to the Web site, the congressional Web site and see what was passed.

You are going to hear some facts and figures. I was a prosecutor for 18 years. Actually, I started working in a bakery, a wholesale bakery, at 17. I worked in that bakery until I was 33. The owner died, and a new company came in. They overlooked me for a promotion because I didn't have a college degree, but they wanted me to train the guy with the college degree coming in. I went home and said to my wife: I want to go to college and law school. My wife worked full-time, and I worked part-time. We got through college and law school, which normally takes 7 years, in 5 years. I wouldn't have been able to do it without my wife.

But I know what it is like to work in a factory 60 and 65 hours a week. I know what it is like to stretch a paycheck. My wife knows what it is like to stretch a dollar from here to next year. And I also know what it is like in the criminal justice system as a prosecutor for 18 years. I have seen it all. I have seen the worst sides of life that I have ever seen. But do you know what I have a passion for? It is the children. And our children's future now is dismal.

My father gave me a better life than he had. I am not sure I can do that for my children. They are now looking at over \$50,000 of debt—each of them. So that means that every dollar that they earn, over 50 percent of it—if we ever get to the point to pay the debt down—is going to our debt.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

At this time, I am going to yield to a new Member from the State of Ohio. BRAD WENSTRUP is with us today. He has done remarkable work since he has gotten here in just a little over a year.

So, Mr. WENSTRUP, thank you for being with us today.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you very much. I appreciate that, Mr. KELLY.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We have an inactive Senate with HARRY REID at the helm as the majority leader. Someone on the Senate side seems to have hit the pause button, and it has been stuck there for a while, and we

are having to deal with that. But here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, we have passed over 200 bills since I came to Congress that just seem to be gathering dust over in the Senate.

We have hardly been inactive on this side of Congress taking up important energy, education, health care reforms, and numerous jobs bills—some Republican bills, some Democratic bills—and most passed with bipartisan support. Yet Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID has thrown them on the ground.

Ohioans ask me what we are doing here in Washington, D.C. I am at my wit's end trying to explain that every reform-minded bill that I have supported that we passed on behalf of the American people is stuck in the Senate. It is a legislative purgatory. It just sits. And I don't wish that on my fellow Ohioans or my fellow Americans. I am not asking the Senate to agree with every bill that we pass, Mr. Speaker, but at least allow a vote and at least allow a discussion.

One example is the Keystone XL pipeline. The energy security legislation passed the House with bipartisan support nearly a year ago; 241 Members of Congress voted for the Northern Route Approval Act. More than that, a filibuster-proof majority of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, are on the record as supporting this project.

A recent Washington Post-ABC poll demonstrates that the American people also support the goals of this legislation of building the pipeline by nearly a three-to-one margin. But the Senate has thrown the bill on the floor blocking any vote. Does the Senate have a solution? Not really. They just seem to want to stand in the way.

Another example is the SKILLS Act. I hear from Ohioans frustrated that Washington isn't working, especially in year 6 of this Obama economy with disappointing job growth. And as we continue to face unacceptable unemployment levels, the Senate refuses to take commonsense steps to get Americans back to work.

Over a year ago, I was proud to support the SKILLS Act, legislation that would have helped job seekers, helped employers, reformed government, and cut bureaucratic costs so that more money can go directly to help people getting back to work. This legislation offers a long-term solution to help those looking for work, combined with smart government reforms. And what do we hear from Senate leadership? Nothing.

It is bipartisan frustration, I think, on some parts because these aren't just Republican bills that are being blocked. Nearly three dozen Democratic-sponsored bills have passed the House of Representatives with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle—no action in the Senate. These are noncontroversial bills. But some in the Senate are more concerned with demonizing individual Americans than helping every American.

The legislative branch is the most direct representation of the American people, yet the Senate leader is content to hand over his constitutional responsibilities to President Obama and the executive branch rather than do his job and to legislate. It is a myth that this is a do-nothing Congress, but we are witnessing a do-nothing Senate.

I ask Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID: relieve this legislative backlog; hundreds of bills and millions of Americans are waiting.

Here in the House, we have taken action. We are active. We have taken the vote. We have taken the action as far as we can take it, and America waits for a further response. Most of these bills that we pass usually involve having less government involvement, not more, not more involvement. The table is set. Our Founders set it up in such a way that we are to represent the people and we are to act, and the Senate is to act, and we are all supposed to come together at the table. I have been here just over a year, and I have been waiting at that table. I have been waiting for the Senate to engage with us. I have been waiting for the President to engage with us. But that hasn't happened.

I left a medical practice to serve here, and I am proud and honored to be here. People often ask me, well, what is the difference between a doctor and being here? Well, as a doctor, I can make a diagnosis. I can get together with a patient and their family and provide a treatment, and together we go to work on that. It takes both of us to do that. Sometimes when you make the suggestion of a treatment, you even suggest that there be a second opinion. And I can tell you right now on all of these things that we have passed, all these treatments that we have recommended, we are still waiting for our second opinion from the Senate.

The House is active. We are waiting for the Senate to take up the arm and do their job, as well.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank Mr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. MARINO and I were talking for a second. Mr. MARINO had touched on something that had just happened recently when you talked about activity on the Senate floor and inactivity on the Senate floor. There was a night not too long ago where the Senate talked all night long, and I think Mr. MARINO wants to just touch on that right now.

Mr. MARINO. If this were not nauseating, it would be hilarious. There are millions of people out of work, Mr. Speaker, millions of people who are losing their health care and millions more whose health care is increasing. There are 230 pieces of legislation sitting on HARRY REID's desk. And do you know what they debated a couple weeks ago all night on the floor? Nothing to do with jobs, nothing to do with deregulation, and nothing to do with getting out of the way of the hardworking taxpayer business. They de-

bated climate change all night on the floor.

Now, there is no one that is more than a conservationist than myself. I live out in the country. I love seeing the bear and the deer walk across my property. I get my water from a well. My children have grown up there. I will do everything I can to protect my children and make sure that the air they are breathing is clean, the water is clean, and the land is pristine. But do you know something? I am pretty sure the hardworking taxpayers, the people in this country, the farmers in my district, and the entrepreneurs in my district want to see the government get out of the way and let entrepreneurs and business do what it does.

I am a states' rights guy. I believe the less Federal Government in my life the better. That is proven by—I just met with a group of entrepreneurs a little earlier. They are called start-ups. They are young kids. They are geniuses who know the IT industry and who create apps, create hardware, and create software. They are saying to me: Congressman, our hands are tied. We are being overregulated, and we have a lot of good ideas that will help the American people.

You are going to be hearing some figures quoted. I am not a big figure guy, but I think it is important that you listen to these figures and see these figures. But I want to tell you where I got them, because as a prosecutor, I always had to back up, in court, where I got my evidence and cite it.

You have all heard of the Congressional Budget Office. We refer to it as the CBO. I am going to tell you just in two sentences what the Congressional Budget Office does. The Congressional Budget Office, CBO, is a Federal agency within the legislative branch of the United States Government that provides economic data to Congress. The CBO was created as a nonpartisan agency by the Congressional Budget and Improvement Control Act of 1974, which means they are independent. They are not Republican, and they are not Democrat. These are people who crunch numbers, make estimates, bring us information, and then submit it to us so the American people know what the actual facts are.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. MARINO.

We all have similar experiences. I know you do, BRAD, when you are back home; and, TOM, I know you do when you are back home. It really doesn't matter where we are. A lot of times it is coming out of Mass on Sunday morning, and sometimes it is just being down at the K-Mart or the Walmart, or maybe I am up in Erie and I am out near Presque Isle, or I could be in Grove City or I could be in Slippery Rock, and people come up to me all the time and say: Do you know what? You all need to get busy. And they talk about: We don't want to hear any more about the battles between Republicans and Democrats. Quite frankly, we are

tired of hearing it because, if you can't work together, you can't get things done. And then the question that comes up is: Can't you just compromise once in a while to get something done? And then you have got to scratch your head and say: Yes, but, do you know what? We are doing an awful lot right now, but you are just not hearing it.

The reason that comes about, and we all know this, is because the biggest megaphone in the country right now is at the White House.

Now, BRAD, you and I sat here, and, TOM, you and I sat here during the State of the Union. The President made a very chilling statement. He said:

America can't wait, and I can't wait. And if this Congress won't act the way I want it to do, I will go around them, and I will get it done.

Half of this side of the House stood up and cheered that, cheered up their forfeiture of their duty of the oath that they took when they came into office.

Now, I stand here today as a representative of Pennsylvania's Third District. That does not mean that I only represent Republicans that live in the Third District of Pennsylvania. That does not mean that I am only concerned with the concerns of Republicans in the Third District of Pennsylvania. That does not mean that I represent anything else but every single person—every citizen—that resides within that district.

So the things we are talking about today are not Republican issues, and they are not Democrat issues. These are American issues. We are talking about American jobs. We are talking about getting back to work. We are talking about coming here, taking an oath of office, and then fulfilling that oath to the people who sent us.

Now, I know that you go through the same thing. I have many people that approach me and say: Do you know what, MIKE? I didn't vote for you. And I say to them: Well, do you know what? I didn't know that until right now, but I will forget about it, believe me. And they will say: Well, this is an issue I have, and these are some things that concern me, and I just want to know where are you all going and what is it that you are trying to do? And why can't you get America back to work? Because you all said when you ran for office that we have got to get this Nation back on track and we have got to get America moving in the right direction. We have got to get America being America again.

We know that oftentimes in our life we look at all the problems we have, and the answer to everything right now is these things need fixing. Now, how do you do that? You can only do it with a very dynamic and robust economy. So when I hear the conversation that takes place either in our Chamber or the Senate Chamber and you start to say to yourself, it is nice to have that conversation, it is nice to have that little talk, and it is nice to have that debate, but do you know what? You

haven't created any jobs. Because without a dynamic and robust economy, it is all just idle chatter. It is just politicians getting up, speaking and hoping that somehow they hit a chord with some constituents somewhere that says, boy, she is speaking for me or he is speaking for me.

□ 1700

We speak for everybody, not just the towns we come from or the townships we come from or the counties we come from or the States we come from, but this entire country.

So when we look at what is going on now and people say: yes, you say that is going on, but you know what, there is no proof.

Here is what I would ask our friends to do because the President says this all the time. He says: you know what, pick up your phone or pick up your pen, and that is what I am going to do, and I am going to get things done; I am going to use my executive powers, which are vast and enormous, to do what I want to do, despite what Congress may say, despite especially what those characters in the House of Representatives are pushing down your throat because that is just not what I want you to hear.

Well, my message to the American people is: you all have phones, and you all have pens, and you all have the ability, because of the country we live in, to speak out on anything, any time, anywhere you want; no place else in the world can we do that.

As an example today, as my colleagues and I are doing—because, as I said earlier, it is time to do some mythbusting, it is time to call a halt to this idle chatter about what America really needs.

We know what America really needs. America needs to get back to work, and this Congress needs to get out of the job creators' way. We need to get the heavy regulatory boot of the government off the throat of our job creators, and we need to let them breathe again.

We need to let them look to the future with some certainty and know that you can go ahead and plan. You can go ahead and make a strategy. You can go ahead and look to the future with a great degree of success waiting for you.

Now, opportunity is there for everybody. There is equal opportunity. There is no question about that. We know there is not equal outcome. My goodness, that is just not the case.

We do know that hardworking Americans throughout our history have done things that are absolutely incredible, and they have done it because of a government that lets people be free. It gives them liberty to go on and do what they need to do and when they want to do it and the ways that they want to do it.

There is no place else in the world, so the question comes down to: Why now? Why now have we hit such a logjam?

Why is it that we can't get a law to get America back to work?

The answer is quite simple. Mr. MARINO has talked about it. Mr. WENSTRUP has talked about it. My goodness, there is another election coming, and if it truly comes down to we can't get these things done because of another election coming, then we can never get anything done because there are elections every year.

Now, if Mr. REID can say to his people in the Senate and if he can look to this country and if he can go on TV and tell people these things you are hearing about the health care law are all lies, these things have been conjured up by people who don't really exist, the stories that they are spreading are lies, there is not a shred of evidence that would support what they have said—now, he stands in front of the American people and says that you are all liars and that we are not going to tolerate that type of behavior.

Then he goes behind his desk at the Senate and said: all of those pieces of legislation, those 220 House-passed bills, put them on the table because we are not going to talk about them. We are not going to debate them. We are not going to amend them. And you know why we are not? Because there is an election coming.

Right now, there are a third of the Senate Members up for election. That is their rotation—a third, a third, and a third. Every couple of years, there is a third reelected, or new Senators come in.

He has placed the reelection above the redirection of this country. The reelection of his Senate is more important to him than the redirection of this country. That is absolutely unforgivable.

So I would just ask our friends, as they listen—and this is a message to America, not so much to the House of Representatives or to the Senate because we are pretty much ignored, but let me just say this: for those of you who are at home and listening to this, there are several things you can do.

I said about picking up your phone or picking up your pen. How about this, just getting on your computer. Go to www.speaker.gov/jobs. You can also go to majorityleader.gov/bill-tracker.

What will these two sites give you? They will give you everything we are talking about. It is all there. You don't have to come to Washington to see us. You don't have to send away for a book.

You don't have to do anything except go online and pick up this information. You can sit at home and see what it is this House of Representatives has passed; and then you, too, can sit, as myself, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. WENSTRUP do every day, and ask: What is it that we are waiting for?

The answer is leadership; quite simply, it is leadership. America, right now, is hunting for champions. They are hunting for people who will rise up and take control of this situation, and

this idea that, somehow, somewhere, some knight in shining armor has to come riding in on a white charger to get us there is baloney because, every election, it comes right out your hometown.

It comes right out of your churches, and it comes right out of the folks you work with every day and have grown up with and have lived life with. That is who is here. That is who is here. It is so unique; it is the only place in the world that you can do it.

I just tell you, because of the social media, you can go as an individual in your home. You don't have to get in your car and drive anywhere. You don't have to waste any money on gas. You don't have to worry about sitting in traffic.

Just sit at home and go to those two sites, www.speaker.gov/jobs or majorityleader.gov/bill-tracker. You can find out everything we are talking about.

Mr. WENSTRUP, you did talk about the Keystone pipeline, and we ask ourselves all the time: What is the holdup on the Keystone pipeline?

One person, one person; and if you don't know where that person is, let me give you a clue: he lives in a white house at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. This is not a tough place to find.

Pick up the phone and call him. Tell him: Mr. President, let's get back to work; Mr. President, let's make America energy independent; Mr. President, let's quit worrying about the next election, and let's get this country back in the right direction.

We can do it as a people. We can do it together. We must do it. It is not just a responsibility. It is our obligation, not just for the future, but to all those from the past.

So I would just tell you, my friends, there is so much going on right now, and I really would like my two colleagues, let's all join, and we can have a colloquy right now between the three of us and talk back and forth because I think it is important for the people of America to understand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward Senators and are further reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to Mr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. WENSTRUP. The gentleman mentioned the Affordable Care Act, and you mentioned a phone and a pen. I would encourage all Americans to use their phone and to use their pen to let the other parts of our government know where you stand and know that you do want to see some action taking place.

We are a Nation of laws, and we should live by the rule of law. It is very difficult for the American people to understand when certain laws are passed and signed by the President and then just changed as though it is a menu, you can just select which laws you want to enforce.

That makes it very difficult for the American people to understand, and it makes our job more difficult, too, as we go ahead and pass laws.

While we are talking about some of the things that we have done here in the House, both in the 112th and in the 113th Congress, we passed the REINS Act. For those who aren't familiar with the REINS Act, basically what it does is it brings more power back into Congress and into those who represent you. It gives you a voice.

We have established, over the years, many agencies where we have empowered those agencies, and we have empowered the people within the agencies to make the decisions, and often, it is punitive, regulatory decisions that they are making, so this makes it very difficult for our businesses.

What the REINS Act does is it says that, if a regulation has a negative economic impact of over \$100 million, then it has to be approved by Congress. That gives you, the people, a chance to reach out to your Representative and let them know how you feel about these regulations, rather than just having a bureaucracy deciding that this is what is going to take place.

As I said, I think, over the years, this body has given up some of that power to these agencies, and that takes it away from the American people, and we want to get that back.

Now, we talk about if it is over \$100 million of negative economic impact. Well, I tell you I rarely see a regulation that has a positive economic impact in America, and so this is an opportunity for us to get that back.

Again, it is something that we passed in the last two Congresses here in the House of Representatives, and it has not been taken up in the Senate.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this and many other issues, and I thank him for putting this time together.

Whenever anyone says it is a do-nothing Congress, they are only half right. It is actually a do-nothing Senate.

In this Congress, the House has passed and sent over to the Senate 311 total bills, and we have talked about the 220 jobs-related bill. There are 311 total bills.

In stark contrast, the Senate has sent to the House only 67 bills. The Senate produces just about one-third of what the House does—one-third of the work, Mr. Speaker.

I am not saying that passing bills in and of itself is an unalloyed good. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, is a primary example of that, but it is one way to measure how hard you are working.

From the House Natural Resources Committee I sit on, we have passed six bills opening up American energy that would create over 1 million new jobs,

lower gasoline and electricity prices, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and help lower our national debt by generating over \$1 billion in new revenue. These bills are now stalled in the Senate.

The U.S. Senate has turned into a productivity graveyard. President Obama has signed only 24 Senate bills into law during this Congress. In contrast, 91 bills from the House have been signed by the President into law. These are total bills of all different subjects.

Senate Democrats' sole concern seems to be protecting themselves from taking recorded votes that might anger their liberal donors or their voters. They do this by closing off debate, eliminating amendments, and writing their bills in secret, shutting out Republican voices and input.

This broken and dysfunctional Democrat Senate has produced many disasters for the American people and not just ObamaCare. They also passed the trillion dollar so-called Stimulus Act, refused for 4 years to pass a budget, and allowed the President to balloon the national debt in five short years from \$10 trillion to \$17 trillion.

Don't let the President or HARRY REID fool you with false narratives that those rascally Republicans are holding up the Nation's business. This is just another gimmick to shift the blame away from where it really lies.

Our country deserves better. Bills that would grow our economy and put millions of our friends and neighbors back to work should never die in the depths of the Democrat Senate. It is critical for every single American to let Senate Democrats know that they are sick and tired of the do-nothing Senate.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank Mr. LAMBORN.

If I may inquire, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I heard a little bit ago when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were talking about ObamaCare, and they said that Republicans tried to repeal it over 40 times; and that is true, we did.

We tried to fix it, with no help from the other side, but he said, twice, that we didn't have anything to offer. Again, that statement is not correct.

Look at H.R. 3121, American Health Care Reform Act. It repeals ObamaCare and puts together a health care program that physicians and hospital administrators and the public took part in suggesting what we need in a health care program, so it is there. It is backed up. H.R. 3121, we did do something.

Now, we need to talk a little bit about some issues concerning what my colleagues have said with regard to ObamaCare.

I just recently heard and verified this by my staff that the House minority

leader, NANCY PELOSI, said Tuesday that the Founding Fathers—talking about Franklin, Adams, Jefferson, and Washington, the Founding Fathers—would be pleased with ObamaCare because it means that Americans can pursue happiness without being stuck with a job just to have health care.

□ 1715

This is the same person that says we have to pass it so we know what is in it. Well, we all know what is in it, and we all know what is not in it.

Now, I want to make a point clear. Congressman KELLY and myself, this is our second term. We new Members of the House, we have a little different approach to things.

This \$18 trillion of debt that we are in, this just didn't happen over the last couple of years. This happened over the last 50 years. I often say to my constituents, if I had the ability to have every living President in a group of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, and every leader, I would say to them: how dare you do this to us; how dare you, Republicans and Democrats, put us into this debt.

The Republicans had some opportunities when they had control of the House and the Senate a decade or so ago, but times are changing. There is a new breed here.

I just want to bring some issues to your attention concerning ObamaCare that the American people need to know about. When ObamaCare was first implemented, first told about what is going to happen, it was supposed to cover 60 million people. Again, go to the Congressional Budget Office Web site at www.cbo.gov. It is supposed to cover 60 million people at a cost of \$900 billion and some change over a 10-year period.

You were told you can keep your doctor; you can keep your health care program. If you didn't want to participate in ObamaCare, you didn't have to. And do you know something? It wasn't going to cost you one penny more. Well, the Congressional Budget Office just released new figures and they simply put it this way: instead of covering 60 million people, maybe—maybe—ObamaCare will cover 24 million people; and instead of costing \$900 billion, it now is closer to \$2 trillion.

And, oh, by the way, were you able to keep your insurance that you had prior to ObamaCare? No. The President said you could, but you can't.

Were you able to keep your physicians? In many instances, no.

Your rates weren't going up. How many of your rates stayed the same? We are talking about millions of people, millions and millions of people who lost insurance because of ObamaCare, and millions more whose insurance rates went up significantly.

The President waived more than 30 provisions of his law in order to try and make it work, number one.

Despite his promise that everyone who likes their plan can keep it, between 4 and 7 million Americans have had their health care plans canceled.

Approximately, 7.5 million seniors will be forced from their Medicare Advantage health care plan of choice in 2014. Others will see more than \$3,700 in services cut.

ObamaCare imposes 21 different taxes on Americans and businesses and an additional cost of more than \$1 trillion to Americans and the economy.

The workforce will shrink. My colleague said there is no evidence that the workforce would shrink. Well, you go to www.cbo.gov and you will read that the workforce will shrink by 2.5 million jobs because of ObamaCare. Not a good sign for the 4 million Americans who have been unemployed for over 6 months.

Eleven million small business employees will see premiums rise under ObamaCare.

And Medicaid, a program that already has reimbursement rates below Medicare and one in which one out of three doctors does not accept new patients will see enrollments rise by more than 91 million Americans, 34 million of whom are childless adults.

This, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, this does not work, and we have to fix it. We have offered a way to fix it, but the President said there is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank Mr. MARINO.

I think, Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the end of time, I think it is time for us now to take a look at the world and our place in the world. Geopolitically, we know we have been hurt lately because America has decided to follow something called "leading from behind." I have absolutely no idea what that possibly could mean.

But I hear constantly about the next great emerging economy. You sit back and say, well, who could it possibly be? Well, let me tell you who it is, and it doesn't take much guesswork. It is us. It is the U.S.

Now, why do I say that? Because right now we are uniquely positioned in history at this moment in time to be the greatest economy the world has ever seen. Why? Because we have been blessed by our Creator with abundant, accessible, and affordable fossil fuels. These can be extracted safely, and that creates thousands of jobs. This can lower our cost per energy unit far below anyplace else in the world and allows us, in fact, to let our wages rise because our cost of producing goes down as far as energy is concerned.

What else we have, if you look just to the north of the district I serve, the Great Lake system is there. Lake Erie is there. Also what is there is one-fifth of the world's freshwater. Also, if you were to look at our land, our tillable soil, the production per acre that our people in agriculture are able to achieve.

So I would ask you then, at this point in time, at this point in history, if we know that really what we need to do is to have a robust and dynamic economy, what would be holding us

back? It certainly is not our cost of energy, because we are blessed with energy everywhere. It has been placed there by the Good Lord for us to use. Through new technology we are able to extract it. We are able to heat and cool our homes, to light our homes, to run our factories, to light our streets at night, to do almost anything we want to do at a rate that is lower than anyplace in the world.

In fact, we are at a point right now we don't have to rely on anybody else on this globe other than ourselves. We can be energy independent. We have drinking water that the rest of the world would love to have. And we have the ability to produce, as you know, Mr. Speaker, because of where you come from in California, the ability to produce food for a population that doesn't need to go starving, it doesn't need to look to the rest of the world for help, because we can create it right here, right now, for every single American.

The question becomes then: Why are we where we are at right now? Why do we have the lowest labor participation rate we have had in 35 years? My goodness, when you look at all the assets, when you can look at everything that we have, when you can look at the opportunities we have, when you can look at everything, being there and being within our grasp without too far of a reach to get there, the question becomes: What is holding us up? What is holding us back? What is keeping us from achieving that destiny that we have been granted by the Lord? What is keeping us from that?

Look, I would just say this. There are many, many millions of Americans that are out of work. All you have to do is go out of this Chamber and go down the hall and I can show you a lot of Americans that actually have a job that aren't working. I can show you a Senate that continues to sit on all these jobs bills, on all this legislation that would get America back to work.

I am so sick and tired of hearing about, well, you know, if the House would just do something. I will tell you something; I would suggest this: the President would wear out his fingers on that phone calling HARRY REID; in fact, his left arm would probably go numb from signing all the legislation that could be sitting on his desk right now.

What is holding it up? What is the roadblock? What is keeping us from that pathway to prosperity? Do you know what it is? It is a do-nothing Senate. It is a Senate that sits back and calls the American people liars. It is a Senate that sits back and distorts the facts. It is a Senate that puts out, every day, myths about a House of Representatives not working. It is a Senate that had to go under the gun to pass a budget and say: Do you know what? Here is the deal. You don't pass a budget, we don't pay you.

Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me? You have to threaten them that you are going to cut their pay if they

don't pass a budget. Oh, Good Lord. I would like to see us do that in our schools. I would like to see us do that in our homes. I would like to see us do that in our factories and in our businesses in the private sector.

When we have to pass a bill to make them pass a budget, is that where we have reached? Have we reached the depths? Is that how low we have become?

It is a great honor and a privilege to serve in this House. It is a great honor to come before the people and to go home and say: We are working hard for you. We are going to do the best we can do.

But do you know what? It requires a little help. It requires a little help. This system, this system where there are two Chambers, it requires us being able to get things through the House, which we have done. 220 House-passed bills are stuck in a do-nothing Senate right now. It requires some teamwork now. It requires us to truly be the "united" States and not the "divided" States of America. It requires us to be a body that works for the American people and not for a political party. It requires us to work on an agenda that puts America back to work and does not worry about the next election that is coming up and worries about the new direction this country needs to go in.

It is a responsibility to take advantage of all those assets the Lord has given us; and it is time for the United States to now become the next great emerging economy, one that will be heralded all over the world, one that the rest of the world is looking to and scratching their head and says: My goodness, you have got everything. What is it that you are waiting for?

And the answer, again, is leadership. That leadership has got to take place, and it has got to take place soon.

We will continue to do our job in the House of Representatives. We will continue to push bills forward. We will continue to debate and amend bills. We will continue to pass bills, and we will walk them down the hall to the Senate. But after that, the Senate has to pick these bills up. It has to debate them. It has to amend them. It has to vote on them, and it has to send them down to the White House for the President's final signature.

If we are truly going to get America back to work, then let's get to work. My colleagues in the House have already heard that clarion call and they have done their job. I am just going to yell it down the hallway as we walk out of here tonight: Hey, you all need to get to work because America is waiting for you to lead. Then the phone should be ringing off the hook in Mr. REID's office and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue as America says it is time to get up off your seat and get the job done.

It is time to quit talking the talk. It is time to walk the walk. It is time to actually do what we know we can do and take advantage of every single asset the Lord has provided for us.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, thank you so much for allowing us to be here.

Mr. MARINO, always a pleasure to be with you, sir. As we go back to Pennsylvania, we will continue to fight those fights.

Mr. WENSTRUP is gone and also Mr. LAMBORN is gone, but it is good to have colleagues to join us.

I would just tell you this. If there is nobody that sits in this House of Representatives that doesn't want to see America do well, it is just time to get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am going to yield to Mr. MARINO, and he will finish up.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to hit on two areas here for a moment and ask the American people to get more involved, to call your Representatives, to call your Senators, demand from them that we get legislation passed through both Houses, or at least the legislation is brought to the floor for a vote. The American people deserve that.

As I said earlier, I am a states' rights guy, a constitutionalist, worked in a factory, worked in industry, and then put myself through college and law school.

My father, as I said, gave me a good life. My father was a firefighter, a janitor, a painter, and whatever else he could do to raise money to keep a roof over our heads and to feed us. He always said, if you are going to say something, first of all, to someone, that you look right in their eye and you speak the truth. You don't make it personal, and you base what you say on facts and you support those facts.

I am a true believer that Americans, over the last decade or two, even more so today, have been asked to do more with less. Their budgets are tight. Some are laid off. Some are completely out of jobs. They are working one and two and three part-time jobs. But we have the technology out there to create better jobs.

Also, the American people should demand that government operates the same way. I am a believer that the Federal Government is much too large. The left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. It needs to be downsized by at least a third.

□ 1730

From those of us still here, the taxpayers should demand that we do more—do more with less—just like industry does, just like we do at home. The government should operate under that basis.

I am now going to switch back to ObamaCare for a moment. In an article of 2-24-2014 in *Forbes* magazine, it reads: "ObamaCare Will Cost 2.9 mil-

lion or More Jobs a Year." I have more health care people—physicians, hospitals, constituents—constantly calling me, saying, What am I going to do? I can't get insurance or I cannot afford this insurance. We, the Republicans, have put a proposal together, and we would like to see that voted on. We would like to see that get over to the Senate.

I also want to bring something else to your attention concerning ObamaCare, and it is concerning our young people, the future of this country. I have met so many bright young people who are out of college but who cannot get a job. They are very talented. They are smart individuals. There was a feature issue put out by Sea Change, and it was a poll. It reads: "Policy Feature Issue: ObamaCare and Youth—Why Millennials are Right to be Concerned." These are young people, particularly those out of college who can't find work.

It reads:

A recent poll of millennials, released by Harvard's Institute of Politics, found that, today, "only 41 percent of millennials approve of the President's performance, down 11 points since Harvard's last survey in April."

I am going to go further on to read:

With respect to ObamaCare, young Americans are even more suspicious. More than half of the poll's responders believe that health care costs will increase under ObamaCare, with 44 percent indicating that they believe the quality of care will decline. Moreover, almost two-thirds of the respondents say they do not plan to enroll in ObamaCare, which, if accurate, would be extremely problematic for the future viability of the Federal exchanges.

The White House just released that now they have—I heard it on the floor today—almost 7 million. It was 7 million, and then it was over 7 million. Again, the White House has not been consistent with its numbers, and it hasn't, I believe, given all of the information. I read an article here in which it says they are touting that 6 million, 7 million—whatever figure they have come up with—got on the Web site and signed up. There is a big difference there, folks, because, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between signing up and paying. This article stated that most of those individuals who signed up did not pay and that they project that those individuals will not pay. That is what this ObamaCare health care plan was relying on, for young people who are in good health today to pay. Yet they are saying, I am in good health. Why should I bail others out?

Now, let me make this perfectly clear. I believe that everyone should have health care. My daughter has cystic fibrosis, a disease for which there is no cure. The hoops that my wife and I had to jump through and still are jumping through in order to cover my daughter are extraordinary. If there are people out there who cannot afford health care, we, as Americans, have to help them. We have to pay for them. We have to give them health care. That

is what America is about. That is what Americans do. We help people. We try to improve the quality of life.

I am asking, Mr. Speaker, that the American people get more involved in the political system, to be aware of what is out there, to hear what is going on. You heard what I stated and what I cited. Check my facts. Follow up. Just don't take what you hear as actual fact and actual truth. Back it up. Ask your elected officials, Where did you get that information? On what did you base it?

It is about time, as my colleague Congressman KELLY said, that we level the playing field, that we take the handcuffs and the restraints off of hardworking taxpayers so they can give their children and their grandchildren a better way of life. I know that we can do that in this country. We are the greatest country in the world. I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am a member of the NATO alliance. I talk to people who represent 27 other countries about how great America is and about how they look to us and what we can do. Even the countries that do not like us look to America for leadership. They look to America for a better way of life, not only here in the U.S. but around the world.

I have to tell you that every time I drive from Williamsport, Pennsylvania—the 10th Congressional District there—after a week of listening to my constituents and seeing what they go through—my farmers, businesspeople, homemakers, single moms, men who can't find jobs, women who have to work two and three part-time jobs to raise their families—I know we have a responsibility. As I turn on to Independence and as I see the dome of this beautiful building, I can't believe that I am fortunate enough to be here, to represent not only my 10th Congressional District in Pennsylvania but all of America, but it is a responsibility that I chose. It is a responsibility for which I have to continue to fight every day of my life.

I heard one of my colleagues say—and I am going to borrow his line, and I am going to ad-lib it a little bit. He would say to his people as he was speaking to them in a group—and he would stand up and take his glasses off—do you see this line here, this wrinkle here? This was caused by fighting to keep your taxes low. Do you see this wrinkle here? This was caused by making sure that the American people know what we are voting on. This line here was caused to make sure that there is a level playing field, and there is still room on my face for more lines and more wrinkles to keep fighting.

That is what I am going to do—that is what we all should be doing here in the House—to keep fighting for the American people. Down the road, I want someone to say to my children, Do you know something? When your father was a Member of Congress, he did the right thing for the American people and for his constituents.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think my time is pretty close to the end, is it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will take this brief opportunity to thank my colleagues Mr. MARINO and Mr. WENSTRUP for being here and Mr. LAMBORN for being here and for your indulgence and for the American people's.

We have often said—and we have shared these moments together many times—that we have not just a responsibility but an obligation not just to ourselves and to our current generation but to all of those who came before us for all of the sacrifices that they made—for the 1.6 million men and women in uniform who gave their lives that we could have this moment today and those into the future. We have a responsibility to guarantee to them that we made a conscious decision to make sure that their future would be as secure as the one that we were given.

In having said all of that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. I want to thank my friends, Mr. Speaker, who are both from Pennsylvania, for their superb comments. They are so right on everything they have said.

In following up on those comments, there was an article today from The Washington Free Beacon: "Employers Say ObamaCare Will Cost Them \$5,000 More Per Employee." How much more can businesses absorb?

Actually, in the last month, we have been finding out about more groups that are getting money from a health care program informally called "ObamaCare," because it is so hard to call it "affordable" when it is not. They are groups that are getting money from the Federal Government that, it sounds like, are using it more as an opportunity to register voters as Democrats when that money could be used to get a pacemaker or to get a mammogram or to replace a knee for some 85-year-old widow who could really use a new knee or a new hip. Yet millions and millions of dollars are being paid to groups to go out and find people and to do all they can to get them signed up so they can say they had 7 million people sign up. They sign them up all over the country, using millions and millions of dollars that should have been for health care, yet they are using it to try to recruit votes for the Democratic Party. Millions and millions and millions of dollars are being spent on hiring big names that young people will recognize to go on television, to go on radio to try and talk people into signing up for health

care to pay for the health care of others—because they hope they are in good health and won't need it—and that will fund all of the millions and millions of dollars that they are paying to celebrities to convince them to buy ObamaCare.

We know that insurance companies cannot run like the Federal Government and, certainly, not like the executive branch. They can't just announce 7 million people have bought a product if they have not bought it. I haven't seen any insurance companies come out and say, Do you know what? We have had 1.5 million of these or we have had 3 million of these 7 million. Insurance companies have to know who has paid for their services, who has paid for their products. They can't just go along and announce to the IRS, We had 7 million people who bought our products. We don't know who paid for them. We will probably not know for a year or so. We don't know, but 7.1 million have bought our products, but you are going to have to give us a pass for a year or two until we find out who actually paid for it, and then we will eventually get around to telling you how much we owe you in income tax from all of the people who bought or who didn't buy our insurance. They can't work like that, because the IRS will not let them work like that. The insurance companies have to know how much money has come through their doors. They have to account for it. They can't get into this magical math that the executive branch gets into that 7.1 million have paid for ObamaCare and count that as some kind of glorious thing.

We were told there were over 30 million people who didn't have health care and that that was the whole reason health care, itself, had to be turned upside down. Cancer patients had to be turned away from their cancer treatment providers. Of the people who had the doctors they wanted, who were doing great things for their health—keeping them alive—oh, they had to lose them because we had over 30 million who didn't have health insurance. Then we were told, of the 7.1 million or so who may have acquired health insurance under ObamaCare, there is only a small fraction of them who were people who didn't have insurance, part of the 30 or so million who didn't have insurance.

If you are going to cut off people's cancer treatments and if you are going to cut off their ability to get the health care they need—cut off their ability to go to the cancer hospitals they have been going to for treatment—if you are going to basically bring people's lives to an early end because we have got to help those 30 million or so who don't have insurance, then wouldn't you want to get the 30 million signed up? Why are you happy that it is only, maybe, 1 million or 2 million or many fewer who didn't have insurance who have signed up? If it is a fraction of the 7 million who have actu-

ally paid, and if it is an even smaller part of the fraction who paid who didn't have health insurance before and who were part of the 30-plus million, then how is that a good thing?

Why did every Democrat in the House and in the Senate who thought it was such a good idea without a single Republican's input—we didn't get to have any input in ObamaCare. They shoved it through this body and down the throats of the American people. They shoved it through the Senate, and they had to do it quickly before Scott Brown ended up in office, in having that seat. Tragically, they shoved it through without any bipartisan assistance, so nearly half of Americans were not represented in the creation of that bill.

□ 1745

It wasn't done on C-SPAN, as the candidate for President, Senator Obama, had promised. It was done in back rooms at the White House, here. Who knows where. We don't even know who was present.

We know there were some union leaders that met with the President about it, without anybody there to record what was said. We know that they ended up wanting every health care worker eventually to be a union member because their numbers have declined everywhere except in the area of government workers, where Franklin Roosevelt said we should never even have government unions.

So if the 30-plus million who purportedly didn't have health insurance were the real important reason we had to turn health care upside down, that we had to cut \$716 billion from Medicare, so seniors are not going to be able to get care they would have before ObamaCare was passed, if we had to turn away seniors from health care they need just for those 30-plus million that don't have insurance, then why should we be happy that maybe only one-thirtieth or so of that has signed up for insurance?

In the 4 years since ObamaCare passed, the best they could do is sign up 1 million of the 30 or so million that didn't have insurance. That is a good thing?

Most Americans are ready to have some real reform, like having competition. If you need an MRI, you shouldn't have to do like one of the people in my office who was in Boston and under RomneyCare at the time.

The President said they modeled ObamaCare after RomneyCare. She was in a car wreck and couldn't get an MRI for a month or so after the wreck, so she had to fly back to Texas and get an MRI to find out she had broken bones.

This is the kind of care we are heading to. You get put on a list. This is what happens in England and Canada, and that is coming to a health care provider near you. You will get on the list. Why? Because we are told 30 million people didn't have health insurance.

Well, real reform would have made sure not that everybody had insurance, but that they had health care that was affordable and that they could get all the health care they needed and that it was affordable.

In some cases, it would have been a whole lot cheaper than having insurance. Also, having catastrophic insurance for the things you can't afford. Those were some reforms that we wanted to make.

Most of us were okay with fixing a problem called preexisting conditions, which had allowed some insurance companies to really screw over people unfairly. We offered to address that in a bipartisan manner, but the Democrats didn't want our input.

They said they didn't need it. They had the votes without it. They didn't care what we wanted. They didn't care what our constituents thought was a good idea. So we got ObamaCare, and it is wreaking havoc across the country. It is time to repeal it.

So we are told that, under this administration and under those two glorious years when the Democrats had the White House, the House, and the Senate, full control of all the powers here in Washington—and what did they put in motion in 2009 with control of the House, the Senate, and the White House?

Well, now, we find out—the President admitted this last September. It didn't get much press at all, if any, from the mainstream because, of course, they got the President elected, and so they have got to cover for him. We understand that.

But this is staggering. It has never ever happened before in American history. When the President, the Democratic House, and the Democratic Senate put these things in motion, 95 percent of all of the income made in America went to the top 1 percent of Americans. The top 1 percent of income earners in America got 95 percent of the income. Wow.

We talk about how we have really got to help the poor and we have really got to help the middle class, and then we find out the actions of this Democratic-controlled House, Democratic-controlled Senate, and Democratic-controlled White House put in motion the mechanics to ensure that 95 percent of all the income for those years—2009 until it was admitted last September—went to the top 1 percent income earners. Staggering.

Why isn't there more in the mainstream about it? They love to go after the wealthy. Well, because these wealthy are about 70 or 80 percent of the people on Wall Street who donate to Democrats over Republicans. People don't get that. It is shocking.

But it is about 4 to 1 that donations from executives and their spouses on Wall Street go to Democratic candidates.

It is shocking, I know, for some people to come to the realization that most of the wealthiest people in Amer-

ica are Democrats, and they are ready to pull up the ladder behind them. They are thrilled to have a President that will talk about the fat cats.

They don't mind being called fat cats, when they are making 95 percent of all the income in America, they have got a President that talks about the poor and the middle class, and the ones he has helped like nobody else are the ultrawealthy in America.

At some point, people are going to figure this out. At some point, the middle class and the poor are going to say: You know what? I have been supporting Democrats all these years, and now, 95 percent of all the income is going to the top 1 percent. How is that a good thing? Why should I keep supporting the party that is sending 95 percent of the income to the top 1 percent and the Wall Street fat cats have gotten richer than they ever have in their lives?

I don't mind people getting wealthy, but not at the expense of the whole country, and you look at the separation of the wealthy and the middle class. It has never been so dramatically far apart as it is now under this President, with what was set in motion with ObamaCare and all these things that this administration has done.

Crony capitalism has been amazing. How? You can pay over \$600 billion to your buddies that you have known for years to create a Web site. Oh, they forgot to do security. That is going to cost people billions of dollars to try to save their own identity information that has now been out there on an insecure Web site.

You have a Web site that keeps breaking down. Why? Because crony capitalism kicked in and people that are buddies got the contract.

It is just like British Petroleum should have never been allowed to continue drilling in the Gulf of Mexico, but they were buddies with the administration. At the time the Deepwater Horizon blew out, I read that they had people from BP talking to John Kerry about coming out in support of cap-and-trade, so they didn't want to shut them down.

They had hundreds and hundreds of egregious safety violations, compared to others like Exxon and Shell. I think they had one or two or none.

Well, they should never have been allowed to operate. Why? Because crony capitalism is alive and well in this administration and with Democrats in control. Yes, we will let them keep operating. Never mind they are the unsafe drillers in the Gulf of Mexico. That is okay because they are on our side.

America is sick of cronyism. They are sick of favoritism. We don't begrudge anybody getting wealthy, but what we begrudge is gaming the system so the middle class and the poor have no chance because the ladder has been pulled up behind ultrawealthy Democrats by a Democratic administration, and it continues.

So employers are saying ObamaCare will cost them \$5,000 more per em-

ployee. This has got to stop. We have got to repeal ObamaCare and have true health care reform. I know some people say: well, you don't have any ideas.

Are you kidding? The last I saw, there were about 80 different bills—ideas for reform; and what I really want to see us do is, once we get ObamaCare repealed, let's have the full debate. Let's have it on C-SPAN.

Like Candidate Obama said, let's let America see who is really standing up for them and who is cutting those sweetheart deals with unions, who is cutting the sweetheart deals with AARP, the big pharmaceuticals, the AMA, the AHA; who is cutting those big deals behind the scenes in private rooms, so that mainstream America sees 95 percent of the income going to 1 percent, the most wealthy?

Let them see that. I welcome that. We have got to repeal ObamaCare. We have got to.

There is a book Glenn Beck had pointed out a week or so ago. I had not seen it before. It was copyrighted originally in 1942. The Library of Congress has this book. It is "The Road We Are Traveling." It is interesting.

He basically talks about the ways that socialism and communism have failed. Really, socialism and communism are bad words, so you don't want to call it that. We know now it is called progressivism.

Here, at page 95, he talks about:

In war and peace, boom and depression, the march towards centralized, collective controls has continued. Planning has often been identified with socialism. Yet orthodox socialists themselves are far from pleased with the collectivism practiced in Russia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, and they look with grave suspicion on the New Deal. Something has appeared which nobody anticipated, nobody wanted, and nobody really understands.

This was written in 1942.

Mr. James Burnham has called it the "managerial revolution," in the first intelligent attempt to understand it which I have seen. Many more studies will be needed before the mystery is cleared up. We have something called "X," which is displacing the system of free enterprise, all over the world. If we do not know yet what to call it, we can at least describe its major characteristics. They include, in most countries, free enterprise into "X."

He goes on and lists these things. Again, this is 1942. It is interesting.

You can still find on the Internet, Mr. Speaker, a presentation about President Obama from, obviously, a supportive Obama group, called "The Road We've Traveled." It appears to be a clear takeoff from "The Road We Are Traveling" that was written in 1942.

But here is what is described as this new progressive ideal that we are moving toward that he was excited about in 1942 under President Roosevelt and these characteristics of what they call X because they know socialism and communism doesn't go over well. Progressivism sounds a lot better.

□ 1800

But here is this X, a strong centralized government, an executive arm

growing at the expense of the legislative and judicial arms. In some countries, power is consolidated in a dictator issuing decrees.

Well, we have certainly seen, Mr. Speaker, the legislative and judicial arms compromised in this trilateral government, which the executive arm has even said, and got a standing ovation in here, basically, that he will usurp legislative power if we don't use it. It turns out that was an aim that was set out for progressives, socialists, X, as he called it, back in 1942.

He goes on, these are the other things that we are trying to shoot for, according to him: control of banking, credit, and security exchanges by the government.

Well, we know under the Democrat control of the House and the Senate and the White House, the Federal Government took control of all student loans. What a great thing.

Thank God that my kids, we were able to get student loans for them before I had to go begging to a Democratic administration, because it isn't difficult to figure out how easily corruptible it is when the government controls who gets to get a college loan and who doesn't.

So this was set out as what they were shooting for back in 1942. He says also:

The underwriting of employment by the government, either through armaments or public works.

The underwriting of Social Security by the government, old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, unemployment insurance and the like.

Well, we have seen that all come to pass since 1942, just as this Progressive had hoped.

The underwriting of food, housing, medical care, by the government. The United States is already experimenting with providing these essentials. Other nations are far along the road.

This Progressive says he is also shooting for:

The use of deficit spending technique to finance these underwritings. The annually balanced budget has lost its old-time sanctity.

The control of foreign trade by the government, with increasing emphasis on bilateral agreements and barter deals.

The control of natural resources, with increasing emphasis on self-sufficiency.

We have seen the government, with every passing month, take more and more control of natural resources. And since Texas is doing so well, producing more oil, more natural gas than ever, basically, the Federal Government is, in effect, declaring war on Texas. Economically, they have sicced the EPA after Texas. They want to do everything they can to destroy any private resource production.

It just sounds like somebody has had this book, and that the book, "The Road We Are Traveling," fits right nicely in the road the President's supporters say he has traveled or we have traveled.

This goal's progressive—they call it X in the book, but clearly it is the progressive. They want control of transportation, railway, highway, airway,

waterway. Well, that has progressed right nicely since 1942. They want control of all agriculture production. Well, we have certainly seen that take effect as well; control of labor organizations, often to the point of prohibiting strikes.

Now, that is something we haven't seen, but there really hasn't been a need, because when the President, as this President did, issues an executive order that even the IRS cannot enact policies until they have a private meeting with the head of the labor union to work things out behind private doors and it can't be recorded and nobody can know what they discuss, there is really not much reason for strikes. When top labor union heads sit down with the President in a private meeting about health care before they come out with ObamaCare and nobody gets to know what was said and done, why do you need strikes? The heads of the labor unions are working hand-in-hand with the executive branch.

In this book, X, which clearly is progressivism, shoots for:

The enlistment of young men and women in youth corps devoted to health, discipline, community service and ideologies consistent with those of the authorities. The CCC camps have just inaugurated military drill.

Well, it is also interesting that in ObamaCare, in my copy, at the beginning of Page 1312, it talked about—or section 1312, but it talked about the new President's Officer and Non-commissioned Officer Corps, created under a health care bill for international health emergency or national emergencies, and they can be called up involuntarily at the present. So it sounds like that fits right into what was sought as the road to travel.

Then here is another:

Heavy taxation, with especial emphasis on the estates and incomes of the rich.

Well, we have certainly heard that enough.

He goes on and says:

Not much "taking over" of property or industries in the old socialistic sense. The formula appears to be control without ownership. It is interesting to recall that the same formula is used by the management of great corporations in depriving stockholders of power.

And last:

The state control of communications and propaganda.

We have certainly seen that take effect since 1942. And we have people in the House and Senate, my Democratic friends—some of my Democratic friends—that want even more control through the FCC and other government entities to control people's thoughts and what they can put out on the air. Let the government control all of that. It really is outrageous what is happening.

In any event, it appears that "The Road We Are Traveling," written in 1942, by Stuart Chase, setting out what he called X, because socialism, communism were not as popular, are the road that we have traveled. It is time to give the people their power back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to follow my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge Gohmert, in this presentation here tonight.

I have been watching forward with increasing concern about some of the potential decisions that might be made here in this House of Representatives. We have been through some long immigration debates in this saga of what happens to the future and the destiny of the United States of America. It is something that goes back, I will say, in the modern era, to sometime January 5, 2004, when then-President George Bush gave his speech that launched their effort to advance "comprehensive immigration reform."

Mr. Speaker, I had my discussion with the President's west wing at that time, meaning west wing of the White House. I advised them—I should say, I advised him that what you have described here is amnesty. However you want to redefine it, however you want to try to call it comprehensive immigration reform, in the end, amnesty is amnesty. The American people will know what amnesty is, and they will reject amnesty because it is bad policy for our country.

Well, since that time, I will say that that has proven to be true in each one of these national debates that we have had and these waves of national debates that we have had.

That debate that took place in 2005—excuse me, 2004 into 2005 and beyond, when there were, at times, tens of thousands of people, often coming in on buses wearing identical white T-shirts, pressing Congress to suspend the rule of law and give them a special path to citizenship. Through that, this discussion has pivoted on what I called, at the time, the scarlet letter A, called amnesty.

The definition of "amnesty," it comes in different forms. Black's Law has one. There are a couple of other definitions for "amnesty." But the practical definition that applies in this political arena that we are in, this cultural American arena that we are in, Mr. Speaker, is this: to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

Now, the objective of their crime—and in most cases it is a crime. It is not necessarily someone who is unlawfully present in the United States or necessarily guilty of committing a

crime, but it is true in most cases. In any case, we don't always know the objective of their crime, whether it is to come into the United States to get a job and seek a better life and take care of their family. If they cross the border illegally, that is a crime. If they come in legally and overstay their visa, then that is a violation, a civil misdemeanor. And yet, if they go to work in this country, they have to fraudulently misrepresent themselves in order to legally work, then in that case, it is often document fraud, and that is also a crime.

So the objective of their crime may have been a job; it may have been a home; it may have been what is planned to be and often is a better life; and it might be someone coming in here with a different kind of intention. We know that coming across our southern border we have had, I will say, scores of people, at a minimum, who are persons of interest from nations of interest.

Now, that is the verbiage that gets used in our security personnel. If they are from a nation of interest, that is a nation that is in the list, having been a nation that spawns terrorists. If they are a person of interest, they are a person from that nation that is a nation of interest that spawns terrorists.

So you have got kind of a double marker here. Somebody shows up coming across our southern border and they are from Yemen, for example, they are going to be a person of interest from a nation of interest, which means we should pay more attention to that because they are a risk to the security of United States because that is a place that terrorists come from in the records that we have and the data that we know. It doesn't mean that everybody that might come across our southern border from Yemen is a terrorist. It means, though, just what the definition is. This happens on a regular basis.

When anyone is interdicted, apprehended, coming across our border who is a person of interest from a nation of interest, they are turned over, as soon as possible, to the FBI. That act immediately closes the case as far as public discussion is concerned because now it is classified. So, if they are continually classifying the reports and any prosecutions and how we handle persons of interest from nations of interest, that means, Mr. Speaker, that we don't know how many people have been caught coming into the United States with ill will towards us or suspicion of ill will towards us. That is classified.

What I know is I know of seven cases where we have interdicted a person of interest from a nation of interest. And the reason I know about them is because, having spent time on the border, been down there when a person of that definition is interdicted and I gain knowledge of that circumstance, same business day, early enough in the day and close enough to the incident that they can tell me about it before that

individual or individuals are handed over to the FBI where the case becomes classified.

This Congress doesn't seem to be aware that this circumstance exists at all, so they whistle through the graveyard. And it may be a more appropriate explanation than I had actually thought when I started to say it, whistling through the graveyard here on what could be going on inside the United States when people come across the border who are from sources that we normally identify as sources for terrorism. That is one piece.

Another is, 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico. It isn't all their fault. One is that some of those drugs are produced and smuggled into Mexico and then into the United States. Another is there is a huge demand in the United States for illegal drugs. The value of that marketplace in this country could well be over \$60 billion. That is 60 billion with a b. But even the Drug Enforcement doesn't know that number, and they aren't comfortable producing that number. That number actually comes from a media report.

In any case, so we have persons of interest from nations of interest. We have 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs coming from or through to Mexico. It is a threat to our country, a threat to our society.

And on top of that, we have a border that remains porous. We have a President whose administration has been announcing that he has been deporting record numbers of people, but when you look at the numbers, you find out that he is double counting and he has changed the definition of "removals."

□ 1815

He is counting those who are turned back at the border, those who are caught crossing the border that do a voluntary return to avoid it going on their record so that they can avoiding being subject to the 3- or 10-year bar and double-counting some of those that are turned back.

So here are the real numbers, and it is this: That the lead deportations that actually took place in our modern era under—not the George Bush administration, Mr. Speaker—but they took place under the Bill Clinton administration in the year 2000 when there was some number above 1.8 million removals from the country. And we have a President now, under Barack Obama, down around 450,000 removals from the country, a long, long ways from being what they sometimes accept the definition of him as being the Deporter-in-Chief.

No President has taken the position that this President has, that he picks and chooses the laws that he wants to enforce and ignores the rest. No President has so broadly gone out there and violated the limitations in article two of the Constitution.

Just within immigration itself, when the Morton Memos came out—and

those are the memos that created DACA, which is the executive amnesty that was produced and signed by Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, who came before the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, and alleged repeatedly that they had prosecutorial discretion, that they don't have the resources to enforce every law, therefore, they have to enforce with the best effect of the resources that they have, and stated: We have prosecutorial discretion, and it is on an individual basis only, an individual basis only. She repeated it in her testimony under oath before the Judiciary Committee, and I had in front of me at the time the document that describes this, and in a page and about a third of single-spaced 12-point type, it said, used the term "on an individual basis only," by my count, in memory, seven times.

Now why would this administration remind Members of Congress, especially members of the Judiciary Committee, that they were executing prosecutorial discretion by waiving the application of the law to hundreds of thousands of people altogether under this definition of "on an individual basis only"? We know they didn't deal with them on an individual basis only.

When you read that report and you go through and draw a couple of x's and o's, you come to this conclusion: that Homeland Security, under the Morton Memos of ICE, created four different classes of people, and they are broadly exempted from the law by the definitions of the classes of people created in the very memo that says, seven times "on an individual basis only."

This was what I thought was a lame effort to try to cloak themselves in prosecutorial discretion when there is no such thing. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize this. There is no such thing as prosecutorial discretion outside of an individual basis only. It only can be applied on an individual basis. It cannot be applied to classes or groups of people because everyone that is paying attention to law, the structure of law, knows that the law defines classes and groups of people, and the exemptions under prosecutorial discretion have to be justified, justifiable, and on an individual basis only. This administration didn't adhere to that, and they know it. And, Mr. Speaker, they strategized around it so that they could grant what is the equivalent of executive amnesty to hundreds of thousands of people.

Now Senator JEFF SESSIONS has released a report a little over a week ago, and I want to thank him and his staff for the work that they have done to dig the details out of this network of regulations and rules and executive edicts to come down to this point: that the application of the law almost completely exempts the law, itself, which requires those encountered by immigration officials who are unlawfully present in the United States to be placed into removal proceedings. That is the law.

It is real clear that the DACA documents, the Morton Memos, direct ICE to violate the very law that they have taken an oath to uphold, and that is the requirement that they place into removal proceedings those whom they may encounter who are unlawfully present in the United States.

The President has ordered that they not do so, which violates their oath to the Constitution, their fidelity to the law, and their fidelity to the rule of law, and it usurps the directive from Congress, which sets up immigration law here in the United States of America.

This is an appalling assault on our Constitution and on the rule of law and on the separation of powers, and the administration knows it. And I am not drawing this as an assumption, Mr. Speaker. I am drawing this from this understanding.

The President has told us on a number of occasions that he taught constitutional law as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago's School of Law for 10 years. Ten years of teaching the Constitution means you can't avoid coming across these constitutional requirements, and you can't avoid addressing the separation of powers that are distinct between articles one, two, and three of our Constitution. And if we wondered if somehow the President could have taught con law for a decade and not run across the separation of powers concept, or the authority that is granted to the Congress: All legislative powers shall be vested in the body of the United States Congress, the legislative body in article one. All powers, all legislative powers. The President had to have taught that for 10 years. I don't think you can take con law and not encounter that principle. And he didn't.

He didn't avoid that principle. In fact, he was teaching it as recently as March 28, 2011, when he was speaking to a high school class at a high school here in Washington, D.C., when he said to them: You want me to enact the DREAM Act by executive order. But I am here to tell you that you have studied this, and you know that the Congress doesn't allow that. I don't have the authority to implement the DREAM Act by executive order because—and he said this this way—Congress writes the laws; the judicial branch interprets the laws; and my job is to enforce them. It is a very compact and succinct and, I think, a clear understanding of the three branches of government embodied in articles one, two, and three.

So it is clear not only did the President teach this very principle for a decade, but he—and I don't want to say "lectured," but he gave a speech on it to a high school class and said, I cannot implement this by an executive order or fiat; it is exclusively reserved for Congress. Some months later, though, apparently the idea was stuck in the head of the President of the United States, and by executive fiat, he

did do just what had he said publicly he didn't have the authority to do. That is just on the immigration piece.

We could go on through ObamaCare—the 38, 39, or more different changes that have been applied to ObamaCare. Now, I don't assert, Mr. Speaker, that they are all unconstitutional moves on the part of the President, but some of them are so clearly unconstitutional that it cannot be argued with a straight face if you know anything about the Constitution whatsoever.

The clearest, the starkest was, the directive in ObamaCare that the employer mandate shall be implemented in each month after December of 2013. That is real clear. But the President announced months ago, we are going to delay the employer mandate for another year. They are going to add another year to the implementation date. So it is as if the President—you know he said he had a pen and a cell phone. It was as if the President took his pen, went to page whatever it is in the 2,700 pages of ObamaCare, and went in there—it would be a red pen, not a blue one—and drew a line through the number that said 2013, and in each month after December of 2013, drew a line through that and just changed the number 13 to the number 2014.

Now, the President does not have the authority to do that. If he does, then the work of this Congress is meaningless, and it would never have a relation to anything, except we would be a debate body here. So we could be in the business of deciding whether we side for or against the President without any power whatsoever. If the President continues to exert this authority—it is unconstitutional, it is a violation of his constitutional authorities and the separation of power. There are multiple lawsuits that are working their way through the courts, and I think that the administration has done a calculation of, they are not going to catch up with us before the President's term is over and he goes off into his happy perpetual golfing land, that he might.

But this immigration issue sets the destiny for America. It is not a policy like ObamaCare, which is the largest social movement in my adult lifetime, social piece of legislation, social engineering piece of legislation. It is a takeover of a huge percentage of our economy, some say as much as 17 percent of our economy. It is a directive that orders American citizens, for the first time, to buy a product that is produced and specified by the Federal Government or be fined and punished by the Internal Revenue Service.

That is where we are with ObamaCare. That is what it does to this God-given liberty and says, You shall be a subject of the State, and you will buy a product that is approved by the Federal Government. And if you fail to do what we have told you to do, ordered you to do, then we are going to fine you and punish you, and we are going to use the Internal Revenue Service to chase you down and dun you for that money.

Now, that is an appalling thing to a free people. But we should think of that in the context of, first of all, if the Federal Government can order you to buy an insurance policy, they can order you to buy an automobile, they can order you to buy a washing machine, they can order you to go to the grocery store and buy broccoli. They can forbid you from buying—let's just say butter, or whatever it is that the First Lady might think is not the healthy diet for the American people. By the way, they are already dictating the calorie limitations to our kids in school.

This country has become not so much the land of the free any longer. It has become a land where they seek to micromanage every aspect of our lives. It has started. It is going down that way.

But if the White House can configure a bill and pass it through this Congress by hook, crook, and legislative shenanigans, and, in the process of making the deal to get the votes to get it passed, promise a Member of Congress—let's just say a Member of Congress from Michigan—that, never fear if the language that you would like to have doesn't become part of the law, the President will sign an executive order to amend ObamaCare after the bill is signed if the agreement that they make here doesn't follow through in the final piece of legislation that comes from the Senate.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the very idea that the President would promise to amend a bill? He has no authority to amend any bill whatsoever. He has no authority to amend any legislation whatsoever. He has no authority to amend existing U.S. Code of any kind whatsoever.

Now he can influence the executive branch to pass a rule, to publish that rule and take it out for comments. And through the authority granted to the executive branch through the Administrative Procedures Act, they can have the force and effect of law. But they can't change law. They can't amend law. And they cannot write a rule that changes the directive language that is part of the law. The law is the law. The Constitution is the foundation for this Republic, and the laws that are passed by it are supreme, not the President.

So we have this usurpation of congressional authority from the President. We have an ObamaCare piece of legislation that is a taking of American liberty. And we have a President that changes it willy-nilly at will. And not an ability in this Congress to put the brakes on that. But maybe, just maybe the American people will go to the polls in November and bring it around the other way. In 2016, there will be a new President elected. That President must run on adhering to, respecting, and reverting our country back to this Constitution.

But this country, the bedrock underneath our Constitution is free and fair elections, confidence that they are free and fair and legitimate. The foundation

is the Constitution. The Declaration is the promise; the Constitution is the fulfillment.

As we sit here in this most blessed country in the history of the world, Mr. Speaker, we are watching it be taken apart by executive fiat and executive edict piece by piece. ObamaCare changed 30-some times. Immigration changed five or six times. And a President who threatens to go out and do that again, one who suspended Welfare to Work when it was written specifically to tighten up, that a President couldn't suspend the work component of Welfare to Work. And No Child Left Behind, suspended by the application of waivers that go on because he didn't agree with the policy and he thought he had a better policy, but he didn't want to come to Congress because Congress might not think it is a better policy.

This President doesn't negotiate with this Congress. He doesn't work in a cooperative fashion. He imposes the whim of the White House on the American people.

□ 1830

This Congress went through a government shutdown to assert its will and came in to second place on that because not enough Members of this Congress had the will. We watched the Constitution be eroded because of that lack of will.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I see coming is an effort to grant more amnesty through the legislative process instead of, this time, the executive fiat or executive edict or executive overreach process, and the President threatens to use his pen more to grant more amnesty if we don't pass it here in the House.

We have some misguided people on my side of the aisle that ought to be better thinkers than they are. I understand why Democrats are for amnesty almost universally because they get the big political benefit from it.

They have been discouraging me for years from bringing up this topic, that Democrats have long known, Mr. Speaker, that a significant majority, 2 to 1, 3 to 1, 5 to 1—there are even statistics out there of 8 to 1—that newly arriving immigrants, if given an opportunity to vote, are going to vote in those kind of statistics at least 2 to 1 for Democrats.

Here is a King axiom, Mr. Speaker, that newly arriving immigrants will assimilate into the politics of the locale where they arrive because they don't know what party they are when they get here.

They will simply associate with their neighbors, their friends, and their family. When they go to political events, if they go, they will go with them, encouraged by them, and when they go to the polls, they are going to take their first advice.

I look down through my neighborhood. We have fourth generation FDR Democrats that by heritage are Demo-

crats, by philosophy are Republicans, but they don't change, necessarily, their voting stripes.

If someone thinks I am wrong about this, they could go to Boston, and they could find me an Irish Catholic Republican. I am sure one of them exists. I understand there are two. But the heritage of inheriting the politics of the locale where you arrive as a newly arriving immigrant is a big part of this.

That is what drives Democrats. It is not about truth, justice, and the American way. It is not about justice and equity. It is not about fairness. It is about political power, and it is about Democrats seeking to expand the dependency class in America because that expands their political class and their political leverage at the expense of the Constitution, the rule of law, safety in the streets of America, and at the expense of the destiny of our country.

We need to think this through much more deeply. We need to look ahead, Mr. Speaker. We need to see that, if we make an immigration decision in this Congress, we are going to live with that decision and our children and our grandchildren. Every succeeding generation lives with the decisions that we make here on immigration.

It is different than ObamaCare. ObamaCare is bad. It is a horrible usurpation of God-given American liberty. It can be repealed. It can even be, in components, diminished in its negative effects by some tweaks that we could do, and I have got some on the books that I will be advancing here in the upcoming week; but we could repeal ObamaCare.

We could undo it. We could recover. We could even somehow struggle through a massive amendment of it and come out with a product that the American people could live with and still have a measure of freedom; but if we get the immigration question wrong, there is no going back to repeal. There is no going back to change. There is no going back to undo what would be done by the colossal mistake of amnesty.

Whatever you think about demographics, whatever you think about political power, and whatever you think about economics, there is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism that we can't do without and still be a great country. It is called the rule of law.

The rule of law means that the law has to treat everyone equally. Justice must be blind. Lady Justice stands there with the scales in her hands, balanced, and most of the time, you will see her with a blindfold on because Justice needs to be blind and treat everyone equally. If we lose the rule of law, we will never be able to restore it again.

If we sacrifice the rule of law in a misguided idea that, somehow, our sympathy for people that want a better life—and by the way, there are some 6 billion of them on the planet that want a better life—if our idea that our sym-

pathy for people that want a better life is more important than our fidelity to the rule of law, then we have sacrificed the core of the greatness of America because our hearts overruled our heads.

I am not surprised when Democrats do that. That is what they are in business to do, is have their hearts overrule their heads; but we can't let that happen on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, not even—not even—for someone who came into the United States illegally, misrepresented themselves to get into the United States military, put on a uniform, took an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and maybe, just maybe, risked their life in a performance of that duty.

They have already violated our laws, they have already misrepresented themselves, and they have already defrauded the Department of Defense.

Any bill that might be attached to a National Defense Authorization Act or comes to this floor in any form that rewards someone who has defrauded the Department of Defense or the United States—whether or not they have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, it is a false oath because they have given their false word—any bill like that needs to be met with the full rejection of the full vigor of the rule of law here in the floor of the United States Congress.

That includes those things that are coming out now in the press today. We don't need to have an intense fight over immigration. We have an election coming up in November.

We have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution and have defended it, generally, from this side of the aisle and not exclusively, Mr. Speaker.

We have an obligation to defend that rule of law, preserve the sovereignty of America, and refuse to reward lawbreakers. If we reward lawbreakers, we get more lawbreakers. We need fewer lawbreakers, not more.

I will defend my oath to this Constitution and the rule of law, and I will encourage and challenge all of my colleagues to do the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending funeral in district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4152. An act to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1557. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals.

S. 2183. United States international programming to Ukraine and neighboring regions.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5149. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Basel III Conforming Amendments Related to Cross-References, Subordinated Debt and Limits Based on Regulatory Capital [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0004] (RIN: 1557-AD73) received March 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5150. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Annual Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5151. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Southern Oahu Tsunami Vessel Evacuation Honolulu, HI [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0080] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5152. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Havasu Triathlon; Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5153. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Maintenance Dredging 35-Foot Channel and Rock Removal; Portland Harbor, Portland, ME [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5154. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Eleventh Coast Guard District Annual Fireworks Events [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0362] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5155. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Inner Harbor Navigational Canal, New Orleans, LA [Docket

et No.: USCG-2013-0562] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5156. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Terrebonne Bayou, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1072] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5157. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rate — 2014 Annual Review and Adjustment [USCG-2013-0534] (RIN: 1625-AC07) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Altitudes for Use of Autopilots [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1059; Amdts. No. 121-368, 125-63, 135-128] (RIN: 2120-AK11) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co. KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0352; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-14-AD; Amendment 39-17750; AD 2014-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5160. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Christiansted, St. Croix, VI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0757; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-19] received March 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5161. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0736; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-17747; AD 2014-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5162. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0791; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-17745; AD 2014-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5163. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0210; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-053-AD; Amendment 39-17744; AD 2014-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5164. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0054; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-001-AD; Amendment 39-17754; AD 2014-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5165. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0735; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-014-AD; Amendment 39-17748; AD 2014-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5166. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0799; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-153-AD; Amendment 39-17746; AD 2014-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5167. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type certificate currently held by Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0737; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-111-AD; Amendment 39-17739; AD 2014-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5168. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Morrisville, VT [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0683; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANE-1] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5169. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; McMinnville, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0682; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-17] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5170. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Kailua-Kona, HI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0622; Airspace Docket No. 10-AWP-10] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5171. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Salinas, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0708; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-11] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5172. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Grand Forks, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0950; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-34] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5173. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Dallas/Fort Worth Class B Airspace Area; TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1168; Airspace Docket No. 07-AWA-3] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5174. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Atlanta, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0891; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-37] received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5175. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0632; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-17752; AD 2014-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5176. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Use of Additional Portable Oxygen Concentrators on Board Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1013; Amdt. No. 121-369] (RIN: 2120-AK-35) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5177. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prohibition on Personal Use of Electronic Devices on the Flight Deck [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0929; Amdt. No. 121-369] (RIN: 2120-AJ17) received March 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5178. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Materials from Honduras [CBP Dec. 14-03] (RIN: 1515-AE00) received March 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1425. A bill to amend the Marine Debris Act to better address severe marine debris events, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-398, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1491. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide certain funds to eligible entities for activities undertaken to address the marine debris impacts of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and subsequent tsunami, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-399, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 4365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 4366. A bill to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4367. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibilities with respect to Internet domain name functions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 4368. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from implementing proposed policy changes that would permit passengers to carry small, non-locking knives on aircraft; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4369. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require payment to each county of a portion of mining royalties received for mining operations in such county, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 4370. A bill to improve the information security of the Department of Veterans Affairs by directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain actions to improve the transparency and the governance of the information security program of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4371. A bill to redesignate the Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area in California as the Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4372. A bill to require the President to make publicly available an annual report on the use of targeted lethal force by remotely-piloted aircraft; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 4373. A bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4374. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a

standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H.R. 4375. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona, as the "Jim Kolbe Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 4377. A bill to place conditions on assistance to the Government of Burma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4378. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue to Federal agencies guidelines for developing procedures and requirements relating to certain primary care Federal health professionals completing continuing medical education on nutrition and to require Federal agencies to submit annual reports relating to such guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4379. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4380. A bill to prohibit gun confiscation and registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4381. A bill to protect the privacy of individuals' personal genetic information and other personal identifier information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4382. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H. Res. 535. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Financial Literacy Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H. Res. 536. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that telephone service must be improved in rural areas of the United States and that no entity may unreasonably discriminate against telephone users in those areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 4365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 4366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 4368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 4372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 4373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. BARBER:

H.R. 4375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 4378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment: "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV of the United States Constitution—"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 4382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the preceding enumerated powers. It is necessary and proper for Congress to eliminate the National Technical Information Service in the Department of Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 279: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 401: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 494: Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 713: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 718: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 721: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 809: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1199: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1226: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1239: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1313: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1317: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1318: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1696: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1718: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1733: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1827: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1918: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1998: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2084: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2203: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2283: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2296: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2315: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2415: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2499: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2619: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2648: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2661: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2692: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2935: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2939: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FARR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2959: Mr. MCALLISTER and Mr. DEFALZIO.

H.R. 2989: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2996: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3022: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3040: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3335: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3461: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3481: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3489: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3493: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3505: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 3529: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3530: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3548: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3583: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3600: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3610: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3708: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3717: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3722: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3833: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3836: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ENYART, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3852: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3867: Ms. MENG, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3929: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3974: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 4012: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 4069: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 4122: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4135: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4156: Mr. VEASEY and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 4164: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4184: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4190: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4217: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4219: Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 4225: Mr. KLINE, Ms. BASS, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 4227: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4228: Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 4229: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 4234: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JONES, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4249: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4261: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4286: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 4304: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 4307: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4308: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 4315: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 4320: Mr. PETRI and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4321: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 4342: Mr. LONG, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 4346: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 4349: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 30: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 190: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MARINO.

H. Res. 418: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MORAN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 480: Mr. OWENS and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 494: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 509: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BASS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 519: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 525: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 532: Mr. TERRY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3717: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.